



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 30, 2020

No. 20

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day.

As the Congress enters a long week-end following a contentious period of time on the Hill, give them rest. As they encounter the voices of constituents back home, may all their exchanges be fruitful and promise encouragement toward productive work here in the people's House when they return.

May the power of Your truth and our faith in Your providence give them all the confidence they must have to do the good work required for service to our Nation.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. LAWRENCE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

47TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROE V. WADE

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 47th anniversary of the landmark Supreme Court decision, *Roe v. Wade*, that ultimately gave women the right to control their own reproductive health.

Today, that choice is under attack as the current administration and several States have enacted bans to restrict a woman's right to control her own body.

This year proves to be a pivotal year for access to abortion. Next month, the Supreme Court will hear arguments in the case of *June Medical Services v. Gee*.

As co-chair of the Democratic Women's Caucus, I firmly believe that every woman has the right to decide when, how, if, and with whom to begin or expand her family. That is why we must push back against those who wish to take away this legal right.

The public is overwhelmingly in favor of protecting *Row v. Wade*—nearly 8 in 10 Americans.

In the face of increased attacks on women's right to choose, I continue to fight for the reproductive healthcare that all women deserve.

ROOTING FOR THE KANSAS CITY CHIEFS IN SUPER BOWL LIV

(Mr. MARSHALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it seems like just yesterday, but it was 50 years ago that my dad and I sat down

to watch Super Bowl IV. We watched on a black-and-white television, and we watched the Chiefs beat the Vikings 23-7.

We saw Lenny Dawson making long passes to Otis Taylor, one of the greatest linebacking corps in history dominate the game, and we saw Jan Stenerud kick three field goals.

This weekend at Super Bowl LIV, the Chiefs Nation will be coming to Miami, Florida, and I am here on behalf of the Kansas delegation to wish Coach Andy Reid and our MVP quarterback, Patrick Mahomes, the very best and that they have the best game of their life.

And as the Chiefs Nation joins the folks in Miami, I want everyone to stand and join us in rooting the Chiefs Nation on and remember that we are the land of the free and the home of the Chiefs.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA AGREEMENT

(Mr. CARTWRIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, we have cause for bipartisan celebration. The USMCA trade deal was signed into law yesterday.

I want to congratulate the Democratic House negotiating team and thank them for their hard work for the better part of a year to make this a better deal.

Heading the push to lower drug prices and strip out a massive giveaway to Big Pharma were Representatives EARL BLUMENAUER and JAN SCHA-KOWSKY.

Representatives JIMMY GOMEZ and MIKE THOMPSON handled the negotiation to strengthen labor rights in the deal, and they got it to where they earned an AFL-CIO endorsement.

Representatives SUSAN BONAMICI and JOHN LARSON improved protections for clean air and clean water in the deal.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H715

And Representatives TERRI SEWELL and ROSA DELAURO strengthened the all-important enforcement provisions in this deal.

While we can't fix NAFTA overnight, this is a good start, and it will help our farmers and manufacturers create jobs. So I am glad we came together and passed this deal.

HONORING TIMOTHY SWEZEY

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Mr. Timothy Swezey, who passed away on January 11 at the age of 50.

At the time of his passing, he was serving as the city manager of Darien, in the First Congressional District of Georgia. In his own words, that position was the dream job he always wanted. And, as city manager, Mr. Swezey did an exceptional job managing the unique challenges in Darien, including multiple hurricanes, preserving historical buildings, and new developments in the downtown area.

But nobody reaches their dream job without hard work. Prior to his time with the City of Darien, he worked as a substitute teacher, led city recreation departments, and headed a marine institute, all of which prepared him for his excellent public service in coastal Georgia.

Mr. Swezey is certainly leaving Darien a better place than he found it, and his work in the city will be missed.

His family and friends will be in my thoughts and prayers during this most difficult time.

HONORING THE JEWISH FAMILY SERVICE MIGRANT FAMILY SHELTER

(Mr. VARGAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the migrants and asylum-seekers who have been sheltered by Jewish Family Service of San Diego.

On October 1, 2018, Jewish Family Service, along with other members of the San Diego Rapid Response Network, heeded an important call. These organizations were alerted that, due to a drastic change in policy, women and children were being left on the side of the road. They were released with nowhere to go and no resources to get to their final destination.

These nonprofits decided that they would not stand idly by and would assist these deserted families. Despite all the obstacles the organizations faced, they dedicated themselves to welcoming the stranger.

Jewish Family Service Shelter is now in its seventh location, where it has served 21,000 individuals. The shelters have provided a safe and welcoming

place to sleep, fresh new clothes, warm meals, and travel assistance.

I have had the opportunity to tour some of the facilities and believe they follow the teaching of Leviticus 19: "You shall treat the alien who resides with you no differently than the natives born among you. . . ."

I thank Jewish Family Service and the organizations of the San Diego Rapid Response Network for their efforts.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF BRIAN WINTER

(Mr. NEWHOUSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor the life and service of retired Yakima County Sheriff Brian Winter. Sheriff Winter spent his life dedicated to serving his community and his country.

After graduating from Central Washington University, he joined the United States Marine Corps, where he served honorably in Operations Desert Shield and Iraqi Freedom.

As Brian returned to central Washington and worked his way up in the police force, he became known for prioritizing safety and security in schools throughout the county, his ability to build lasting community relationships, and creating meaningful connections with the Yakama Nation.

Soon after being elected as sheriff, he was diagnosed with ALS. Despite his condition, he was determined to serve his full 4-year term, which he did.

Up until the day he passed away on January 25, 2020, Sheriff Winter prioritized others before himself.

I urge my colleagues to join me in keeping his wife and children in our prayers.

His legacy throughout the Yakima Valley will not be forgotten.

HONORING ANN ELIZABETH CHRISTIAN ABRAMSON

(Ms. PLASKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, the Virgin Islands is known for its queens—powerful, dynamic, passionate women who lead. We had Queen Coziah, who led the coal strikes; Queen Mary and "Bottom Belly," who led the labor strikes.

We lost one of our queens last week, Ann Elizabeth Christian Abramson, who was a loyal, fearless, compassionate leader, an entrepreneur, and a stateswoman.

She was born in 1924, the last of 15 children. Ever industrious, even as a child, she left school for several years to help her family when they were in need and then went back.

She was a businesswoman extraordinaire—taxicab business, con-

struction company, bus company, aggregate owner, and the list goes on. She was appointed to our municipal council, where she was the only woman to serve during her time, as well as to our legislature.

She gave tremendously to our community, but I know she also gave to me. When I went to this fearless leader to ask her for support, she not only gave me her support, but she gave me her time.

I saw how she cared for her islands and her people. She was chair of the state Republican Party and helped the Girl Scouts, hospitals, and chamber of commerce. She did it all.

Mr. Speaker, we will remember her legacy and hope she rests well.

NATIONAL BLOOD DONOR MONTH

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, President Richard Nixon designated January as National Blood Donor Month.

The decision to choose January for this occasion was no coincidence. There is often a shortage of blood in January. In the winter months, eligible donors don't give blood as frequently because both the holidays as well as the cold and flu season are quickly approaching.

No matter the time of year, donating blood can help save a life, and there is always a demand. According to the American Red Cross, someone in the United States needs blood every 2 seconds, and approximately 36,000 units of red blood cells are needed each and every day.

However, less than 38 percent of the U.S. population is eligible to give blood, and only 3 percent of those individuals donate annually.

There are often opportunities to donate blood right here on Capitol Hill, and the Red Cross is hosting its next blood drive on Wednesday, February 5, in the Ford Building. I would like to encourage those eligible to take some time out of their day to make a difference in the lives of others by donating blood.

CLEAN ENERGY AGENDA

(Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, climate change poses a serious threat to virtually every aspect of our lives, particularly in my State of New Hampshire, where our economy is deeply tied to nature.

That is why, earlier this week, I was proud to unveil my Clean Energy Agenda with climate experts from across my district to outline policies and bills that Congress can pass this year to move the United States toward a clean energy economy.

I have prioritized 25 bills, most of them bipartisan, that identify areas where Republicans and Democrats can work together to protect our planet and create good jobs.

From investing in energy efficiency to dramatically ramping up the deployment of renewable energy and decarbonizing our transportation sector, my agenda includes a wide range of bills that can be passed if we find the political will to act.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee to advance policies that pave a pathway toward a clean energy future.

HONORING EARL AND DORIS SORRELLS

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Earl and Doris Sorrells, a remarkable couple who dedicated their lives to bettering their community.

Earl passed away on January 2 and was preceded in death by his wife, Doris, last year, leaving a hole in the hearts of many. Since then, their beloved town of Raymond, Illinois, has shown a little less bright.

Almost everyone in town knew Earl. He ran a radio show that aired at 5:30 every morning, dedicated to the latest in Illinois agriculture. Off the air, Earl and Doris and their entire family worked hard running their small business in Raymond.

I knew Earl and Doris for over 25 years. They were some of the most generous people I have ever met, giving back in every way to their community, not only with their financial contributions, but with their time and talents as well. There is nothing that made them happier than their hometown of Raymond, Illinois—except, maybe, the St. Louis Cardinals.

Earl and Doris were very well loved by me and by everyone in central Illinois. They are missed immensely.

□ 0915

MERCHANT MARINERS OF WORLD WAR II CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT OF 2019

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 811, I call up the bill (H.R. 550) to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Merchant Mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II, with the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Merchant Mariners of World War II Congressional Gold Medal Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) 2019 marked the 74th anniversary of Allied victory in World War II.

(2) The United States Merchant Marine (in this section referred to as the “Merchant Marine”) was integral in providing the link between domestic production and the fighting forces overseas, providing combat equipment, fuel, food, commodities, and raw materials to troops stationed abroad.

(3) Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King acknowledged the indispensability of the Merchant Marine to the victory in a 1945 letter stating that, without the support of the Merchant Marine, “the Navy could not have accomplished its mission”.

(4) President, and former Supreme Commander of the Allied Expeditionary Forces, Dwight D. Eisenhower acknowledged that “through the prompt delivery of supplies and equipment to our armed forces overseas, and of cargoes representing economic and military aid to friendly nations, the American Merchant Marine has effectively helped to strengthen the forces of freedom throughout the world”.

(5) Military missions and war planning were contingent upon the availability of resources and the Merchant Marine played a vital role in this regard, ensuring the efficient and reliable transoceanic transport of military equipment and both military and civilian personnel.

(6) The Merchant Marine provided for the successful transport of resources and personnel despite consistent and ongoing exposure to enemy combatants from both the air and the sea, including from enemy bomber squadrons, submarines, and naval mines.

(7) The efforts of the Merchant Marine were not without sacrifices as the Merchant Marine likely bore a higher per-capita casualty rate than any of the military branches during the war.

(8) The Merchant Marine proved to be an instrumental asset on an untold number of occasions, participating in every landing operation by the United States Marine Corps, from Guadalcanal to Okinawa.

(9) The Merchant Marine provided the bulk tonnage of material necessary for the invasion of Normandy, an invasion which, according to a 1944 New York Times article, “would not have been possible without the Merchant Marine”.

(10) In assessing the performance of the Merchant Marine, General Eisenhower stated, “every man in this Allied command is quick to express his admiration for the loyalty, courage, and fortitude of the officers and men of the Merchant Marine. We count upon their efficiency and their utter devotion to duty as we do our own; they have never failed us”.

(11) During a September 1944 speech, President Franklin D. Roosevelt stated that the Merchant Marine had “delivered the goods when and where needed in every theater of operations and across every ocean in the biggest, the most difficult, and dangerous transportation job ever undertaken. As time goes on, there will be greater public understanding of our merchant fleet’s record during this war”.

(12) The feats and accomplishments of the Merchant Marine are deserving of broader public recognition.

(13) The United States will be forever grateful and indebted to these merchant mariners for their effective, reliable, and courageous transport of goods and resources in enemy territory throughout theaters of every variety in World War II.

(14) The goods and resources transported by the Merchant Marine saved thousands of lives

and enabled the Allied Powers to claim victory in World War II.

(15) The Congressional Gold Medal would be an appropriate way to shed further light on the service of the merchant mariners in World War II and the instrumental role they played in winning that war.

(16) Many students of the Merchant Marine Academy lost their lives as they sailed through enemy-controlled waters or unloaded cargo in overseas combat areas, and, as a result, the United States Merchant Marine Academy is the only institution among the 5 Federal academies to be authorized to carry a battle standard as part of its color guard.

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) AWARD AUTHORIZED.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall make appropriate arrangements for the award, on behalf of Congress, of a single gold medal of appropriate design to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purposes of the award described in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (in this Act referred to as the “Secretary”) shall strike the gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE MUSEUM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Following the award of the gold medal under subsection (a), the gold medal shall be given to the American Merchant Marine Museum, where it will be available for display as appropriate and available for research.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the American Merchant Marine Museum should make the gold medal given to the Museum under paragraph (1) available for display elsewhere, particularly at appropriate locations associated with the United States Merchant Marine and that preference should be given to locations affiliated with the United States Merchant Marine.

SEC. 4. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, the Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck under section 3, at a price sufficient to cover the costs of the medals, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

SEC. 5. STATUS OF MEDALS.

(a) NATIONAL MEDALS.—Medals struck under this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of section 5134 of title 31, United States Code, all medals struck under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. ENGEL moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 with the amendments specified in section 4 of House Resolution 811.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 811, the question shall be divided among two House amendments. Pursuant to section 3(a) of House Resolution 811, the portion of the divided question comprising the amendment specified in section 4(a) of House Resolution 811 shall be considered first.

The text of House amendment to Senate amendment specified in section 4(a) of House Resolution 811 is as follows:

In the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the Senate, strike sections 1, 2, and 3 and insert the following:

TITLE I—NO WAR AGAINST IRAN ACT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “No War Against Iran Act”.

SEC. 102. PROHIBITION OF UNAUTHORIZED MILITARY FORCE IN OR AGAINST IRAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The acquisition by the Government of Iran of a nuclear weapon would pose a grave threat to international peace and stability and the national security of the United States and United States allies, including Israel.

(2) The Government of Iran is a leading state sponsor of terrorism, continues to materially support the regime of Bashar al-Assad, and is responsible for ongoing gross violations of the human rights of the people of Iran.

(3) Article I of the United States Constitution requires the President to obtain authorization from Congress before engaging in war with Iran.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF CURRENT LAW.—Nothing in the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note), the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note), or any other provision of law enacted before the date of the enactment of this Act may be construed to provide authorization for the use of military force against Iran.

(c) PROHIBITION OF UNAUTHORIZED MILITARY FORCE IN OR AGAINST IRAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no Federal funds may be obligated or expended for any use of military force in or against Iran unless Congress has—

(A) declared war; or

(B) enacted specific statutory authorization for such use of military force after the date of the enactment of this Act that meets the requirements of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

(2) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition under paragraph (1) shall not apply to a use of military force that is consistent with section 2(c) of the War Powers Resolution.

(d) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this title may be construed—

(1) to prevent the President from using necessary and appropriate force to defend United States allies and partners if Congress enacts specific statutory authorization for such use of force consistent with the requirements of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.);

(2) to relieve the executive branch of restrictions on the use of force, reporting, or consultation requirements set forth in the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.); or

(3) to authorize the use of military force.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This portion shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and

extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the motion to concur.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me start by thanking Mr. KHANNA for his hard work on this measure. No one has worked harder to reassert Congress' constitutional authority over war powers, and I have been glad to partner with him and co-sponsor this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this measure passed the House with bipartisan support last year as part of the National Defense Authorization Act, but the Senate stripped it out before that legislation made it across the finish line.

For all my colleagues who supported that amendment, the events of the past few weeks only underscore the importance of your vote. For anyone who was not convinced this measure was needed last summer, the present crisis shows exactly why we must adopt it today.

Now, there is no question that Iran is dangerous. There is no question that Qasem Soleimani was a hardened terrorist with American blood on his hands; the world is better off without him.

I am the first to speak out about the grave threats the Iranian regime poses to our allies and our interests and our way of life, but we need to address these threats in a way that protects Americans, not exacerbate the threat.

No one expects Iran to behave responsibly. American leadership means that we need to keep pressure on Iran while working to avoid an unnecessary conflict. Instead, the administration seems to be holding a match to kindling.

Let's be clear: The American people don't want war with Iran, and Congress has not authorized war with Iran. So the question is whether escalating tensions with Iran by killing Qasem Soleimani and, according to media reports, undertaking a strike against another Iranian official in Yemen were in America's interests and were consistent with the law.

The past few weeks have shown pretty clearly that this action did not advance America's interests. American citizens want to drop everything and leave Iraq; thousands more troops are headed to the Middle East, alienating the Iraqi Government, a valued partner in the fight against ISIS; Iranian missiles injuring American personnel, even though at first the administration said there were no injuries, none of this is in America's interests.

The administration claimed that the goal of the strike against Soleimani, that the goal of their whole Iran plan, is to restore deterrence. I see exactly the opposite. I see an emboldened Iran seeking to kick America out of the region, getting exactly what they want.

And as we have learned more, it does not appear that the President followed the law here. The President ignored the requirements of the War Powers Resolution. He chose not to consult with Congress, as required by the law. He acted without authorization from Congress. And I have seen no evidence that there was any imminent threat against Americans or our Embassies, as the administration has claimed.

The Constitution gives Congress, not the President, the power to declare war. I feel very strongly about that. We have all marched down the primrose path for the last two decades, with Congress sitting there. There has been no declaration of war since World War II, December 7, 1941, and so it means that we have let the executive of both parties really run roughshod and do whatever the President wanted. Congress just sat there and did not reassert its constitutional role. Well, we are reasserting that role now.

Again, the Constitution gives Congress, not the President, the power to declare war. With President Trump taking steps toward conflict with Iran without any consultation with Congress, we need to reassert the responsibility given to us in Article I, Section 8.

It is simple. If the President wants to go to war, he needs to come to Congress first. This measure simply enforces the text of current law as written in the War Powers Resolution. It preserves the President's constitutional right to act in self-defense, explicitly exempting defensive action allowed under the War Powers Resolution. But it makes clear that the President cannot just skip the critical step of coming to Congress.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle can agree on this matter, as we did last year. Again, this has been done by both Republican and Democratic Presidents. We should all be united here.

This is about upholding the Constitution. This is about checks and balances. This is about all the things we learned about the genius of our Constitution with checks and balances. We have really abrogated our responsibility, and the time to stop that is now. Now is the time for Congress to step up and assert our constitutional authority.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment. I thank Mr. KHANNA for raising this, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this dangerous amendment. I would like to refresh the memory of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

The Iranian regime orchestrated over a dozen attacks against Americans in Iraq over the last 3 months, killing a U.S. citizen and wounding four U.S. servicemembers. They also hit the Embassy of the United States, ordering a

fiery attack on the U.S. Embassy and launched a ballistic missile attack on the United States Forces.

Honestly, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what more the President needs in terms of authorization to respond in self-defense given these events. The President has made it abundantly clear that he is not starting a war with Iran. He has repeatedly shown restraint after Iran's provocations and deescalated when others would not.

When forced by Iran's dangerous escalations, the President has targeted limited military action to defend Americans overseas, using his Article II constitutional authority. This included the strike in Baghdad against Soleimani, Iran's mastermind of terror, who was responsible for killing more than 600 Americans and wounding thousands more. He has blood on his hands.

But my colleagues cannot accept the fact that the President acted time and again with restraint in these matters. They are so blinded by their contempt for this President that they are seeking to tie his hands. They would rather risk putting Americans in the Middle East in harm's way by an Iranian regime with a 40-year history of deadly aggression against us.

This amendment takes legitimate options off the table for the executive branch. In doing so, it shows America divided in the face of mounting Iranian threats, making our Nation less safe. Make no mistake, Iran and others are watching as the Democrats needlessly divide us.

We all agree that, under Article I of the Constitution, only Congress possesses the authority to declare war, but this amendment goes much further than prohibiting an unauthorized war. This amendment uses Congress' power of the purse to preclude any use of force whatsoever against Iran unless it is previously authorized by Congress or provoked by an attack on the territory or the Armed Forces of the United States.

Think about what that means. What can our military do if Iran attacks American civilians or diplomats or commercial shipping overseas? Under this reckless amendment, the answer is absolutely nothing. The United States military cannot fire a single shot until after the successful completion of a bicameral legislative process that enacts law authorizing the use of force. How many Americans would be dead by then?

We need Iran and its terrorist proxies to think twice about attacking Americans, our friends, and our own interests, not enabling them like this amendment does.

Further, this is an unprecedented attempt to limit the powers claimed by every Commander in Chief, both Democrat and Republican, since the War Powers Resolution was enacted over President Nixon's veto in 1973.

This misguided amendment is actually far more restrictive than the War

Powers Resolution itself, which recognizes the use of our Armed Forces for up to 60 days without legislative authorization in situations of war.

This is absolutely not the time to play politics with our national security. Iran's aggression is not going to go away anytime soon.

I would like to quote from a July 8 letter from the Department of Defense when this same proposal was considered as an amendment to the Defense Authorization bill. "The Department strongly opposes this amendment. . . . If U.S. citizens, diplomatic facilities in the region, or other important national interests are threatened or attacked, we must be able to respond promptly and in an appropriate fashion."

That letter was sent 5 months before the attack on the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad. The concerns expressed in the letter are even more urgent today, given the many attacks on Americans in Iraq in recent days.

Bottom line, this measure emboldens our adversary by tying the President's hands on Iran.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, I oppose this legislation, which I believe is politics at its worst. It is dangerous. It ties our Commander in Chief's hands. It emboldens our enemy, the largest state sponsor of terror, the Islamic Republic of Iran. And I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA), the author of this important amendment who has worked very hard on these issues for many years.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ENGEL for his moral leadership in preventing a war in Iran and his moral leadership in stopping the war in Yemen.

This amendment is very simple. It would stop another regime change war in the Middle East.

The gentleman from Texas says that it is dangerous, that it is reckless, that it emboldens our enemies. Does he really believe that 27 Republicans, including Representative GAETZ, Representative MEADOWS, and Representative JORDAN are emboldening our enemies?

□ 0930

Does he really believe that they are divisive against the President? I mean, they are some of the President's staunchest supporters.

It is time, in this body, that we get past the rhetoric, past the sloganeering, and consider why 27 Republicans actually voted for this. Perhaps it has to do with our national security. Perhaps it has to do with reversing blunder after blunder that has cost this country trillions of dollars and lives.

Let's consider the facts. The President says we want to have a pivot to Asia because China is our leading competitor in the 21st century. I agree.

China's GDP, 15 percent of global GDP; the United States, at 21 percent. They are putting their money into building rail, building universities.

You know how much Iran's GDP is of global GDP? .44 percent. Future historians will wonder what were we thinking? What were we thinking?

They say, well, we have got to keep the Strait of Hormuz open. Well, the Strait of Hormuz has been open since 1981. And by the way, China, Japan, South Korea, they need 65 percent of that oil. You think they would allow the Strait of Hormuz to close?

Why is America bearing the cost for these wars when China hasn't been in a war since 1979?

This amendment does nothing, nothing, to restrict the Commander in Chief to protect American interests or protect American allies. It gives him all of the powers of the War Powers Resolution. If we are hit, he has every authority to act and not come to Congress for authorization.

All the amendment says is, before we get into another Middle East war, before we waste trillions of dollars again, that we need to come to Congress to authorize that. I hope that this body will vote for this in a bipartisan way. I hope this time even more than 27 Republicans will join.

And I believe actually voting for this amendment is vindicating what President Trump ran on in 2016, which was a promise to the American people to get out of these endless wars in the Middle East.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), the lead Republican on the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, here is a summary of the situation. On an issue of serious interest and concern to Members on both sides of the aisle, the current House leadership has brought to the floor the most extreme proposals, with limited debate, and absolutely no opportunity for any other idea to be considered.

They are so afraid of losing a motion to recommit that they have overturned 100 years of precedent and practice in this House by even denying a motion to recommit. And thus, they have taken a serious, complex subject and turned it into a messaging bill that will do nothing except encourage our adversaries. I would suggest it is a sad day for the House and for the country.

Now, specifically on this amendment, if this amendment were seriously implemented—and by the way, I think no administration of either party would seriously implement this language—but if it were, it is far more restrictive than the War Powers Act. It says Congress has to approve anything ahead of time, or we have to already wait for the attack to have occurred, and then the President to designate a national emergency. No other time could a President use force against Iran.

So, for example, we could not have carried out the attack against

Soleimani. Even if we had perfect intelligence that he was about to kill large numbers of Americans, we would have to wait until they died first.

Anyone who says, oh, this doesn't restrict his ability; we can always defend ourselves, either you haven't read the language, or you really are trying not to understand the effect that the literal interpretation of this language would mean.

We could not, under this language, enforce sanctions against Iran to try to keep them from getting a nuclear weapon. We could not work with our allies to try to keep international shipping open in the Persian Gulf. We could not engage in cyber operations, even to protect ourselves, until after the attack had already occurred.

Attorneys at DOD believe that at least it would call into serious question our ability to defend Israel if it were attacked by Iran or its proxies.

This language is extreme. It is irresponsible on subject, on substance, tying the President's hands from defending the country.

Now, as I said, there are lots of people who are concerned about this issue, but I do not believe that they have understood or thought through the effects of this language.

One other point. You cannot ignore what is happening in the world. Things are still a little tense between us and Iran, so why bring it up this week, with those tensions still fresh on everybody's mind? I believe the only effect will be to encourage Iran.

So bringing this measure to the floor, in this way, at this time, is irresponsible for our Nation's security and for the integrity of the House.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me say, with respect to the gentleman's statement about process, when our colleagues on the other side of the aisle were in charge, they struck and replaced language in a Senate-passed bill 15 times in the last two Congresses, and this is doing the same thing, which is exactly what they did.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I have enormous respect for my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee. This particular piece of legislation that was brought, it was amended into my bill, H.R. 550, and was debated for more than an hour and a half in the Armed Services Committee and on the floor when the National Defense Authorization Act was enacted. It has been thoroughly reviewed.

And, with all due respect, it is not the end of the world. But it is the reassertion of Congress for our constitutional responsibilities.

Since I first came to Congress in 2009, I have authored legislation and voted consistently to repeal the 2002 AUMF, which is really a very open-ended authorization for the President to do virtually anything he wants.

Yesterday, in a hearing we heard, in an unclassified portion of that hearing, from the Pentagon's lawyers that essentially said the 2002 AUMF allows the President to do anything with any threat that emanates from Iraq. We should consider that seriously; that if, in fact, that is their justification and, in fact, that is also written into the President's, or the White House's view of this legislation; any threat emanating from Iraq, at any time, into the future. Consider that.

There could be no more powerful reason for us than to terminate the 2002 AUMF with regard to Iraq and come to our senses. When there is an issue, bring it to the floor, and allow us to debate how we should deal with Iraq or Iran or any other threat in that area.

Just going into some detail here. The War Powers Act is not eliminated by any of this legislation. It remains in effect. And the President has the authority under the War Powers Act and under Article II of the Constitution to protect America from imminent attack. That doesn't change. None of that changes.

But what does change is that we are bringing back unto ourselves the power that the Constitution gives to us for very good reason; that is, war is a serious business; between Iraq and Afghanistan, probably several trillion dollars, depending upon the estimate and the cost of maintaining our veterans into the future; \$2 trillion, maybe more. Lives lost on every side of the war. And it goes on and on and on.

Indeed, Trump came to office saying he is going to end endless wars. This is our opportunity to reassert our constitutional authority and, most importantly, our responsibility. We should do that.

We can talk process forever, and we seem to want to talk process more than the reality.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from California an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, bottom line, for too long we have failed our responsibility. We really must act to repeal the 2002 Authorization for the Use of Military Force in Iraq, and to set clear parameters about further action against Iran.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, this amendment forbids the President from taking action that he can't take anyway. With or without this amendment, the President cannot attack Iran, or any country, without Congressional authorization unless it attacks us. And even then, his powers are limited to ordering defensive actions unless Congress acts.

The attack on Soleimani in Iraq was against an enemy combatant in a war zone that was authorized by Congress. It was not an attack on Iran.

The only practical effect of this amendment is to send a message of irresolution to our enemies, and to take a cheap shot at the President by implying he would do something he cannot do.

Now, the Lee amendment, coming next, repeals the AUMF that Congress adopted when it foolishly authorized the Iraq war in 2002.

Under our Constitution, only Congress can start a war. But after that, only the President can wage it or conduct the negotiations to end it. You cannot unring a bell, and you cannot unstart a war. Once unleashed, the war-making authority continues until it is terminated by treaty or agreement.

So here are the lessons of this whole sorry saga in Iraq. Congress should declare war only when our country is attacked. When we declare war, we must put the full resources, resolve, attention, fury, and might of this Nation behind it, and see it through as quickly and decisively as possible.

And most of all, having handed the President that power, and having sent our troops into battle, Congress must stand behind its decision, no matter how long or hard that road may be.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO), the vice chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the chair of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation.

Mr. CASTRO. Mr. Speaker, this month, the American people were unwillingly taken to the brink of war at the reckless direction of this administration. As a coequal branch of government, we must ensure that no President can take any military action without coming to Congress first.

Repealing the 2002 AUMF and passing the No War Against Iran Act will prevent any future escalation or military action without the full consideration and consent of this body. At the same time, they preserve the military's ability to take actions in self-defense to protect our forces.

The American people are tired of unnecessary wars that leave our country less safe. It is our responsibility as elected Representatives to prevent our Nation from entering an unnecessary war with Iran. These measures are critical in that respect.

We cannot allow recklessness to lead us into a protracted conflict that is not in our interests and will lead to suffering.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this amendment.

You know, I have seen thousands of amendments during my time here in Congress, but this is the most dangerous I have ever seen. It is far more restrictive than the War Powers Resolution, and it is historic in that it handcuffs the President in advance by

undermining his ability to protect American citizens whom Iran continues to try to harm.

No Member of Congress wants to be at war with Iran, if given the chance, but deterrence is achieved through credible strength, not by publicly tying the hands of the Commander in Chief in advance.

While no American wants to be at war with Iran, Iran believes it is certainly at war with America.

□ 0945

Now this amendment gives Iran's terrorist forces freedom of movement throughout the region, allowing them to plan and prepare attacks on the U.S. Forces with impunity.

The rulers of Iran are an evil regime and have been for a long time. They were designated a state sponsor of terrorism since 1984, after killing 241 marines in Beirut. Today, it is the source of chaos in the Middle East, fostering conflict throughout the region and fueling wars in Yemen and Syria which have caused death and suffering on an apocalyptic scale, and yet this amendment would require the President to wait until after our troops have been attacked to use force against the terrorist forces of Iran.

And that is not all. Then he has to wait until Congress gets its act together to authorize a response. He could only use force to defend our troops, under the language of this amendment, "if Congress enacts specific statutory authorization for such use of force."

Our troops conducting counter-ISIS missions in Iraq and Syria will be proactively prevented from taking action against Iranian forces or proxy forces to stop an imminent attack.

So passage of this amendment rewards the Iranian regime's growing aggression and it emboldens the IRGC, a designated terrorist organization, and their proxy forces in Iraq and Syria, granting legitimacy and freedom of movement to the world's number one state sponsor of terrorism.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this historically ill-advised and dangerous amendment.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Congressman KHANNA for his hard work on this amendment.

All we have heard from our friends across the aisle this morning is a parade of horrors unsubstantiated in fact or law. In fact, we brought together a bipartisan coalition to reassert in this body our constitutional duty in matters of war and peace.

After nearly two decades in the Middle East, Americans have tired of endless wars. We have lost far too many lives and spent far too much money with little progress.

President Trump's reckless escalations with Iran and his abandonment

of our allies have made America and the world less safe. He has no strategy to counter Iran's nuclear ambitions or deter Iranian aggression and malign influence. His rhetoric has put our troops in harm's way and isolated the United States on the world stage.

With this amendment, we assert on behalf of the American people that war with Iran is not in the best interests of our country; we assert that the President does not have a blank check to commit more American lives to yet another war in the Middle East; and we recommit ourselves to robust diplomacy and the need for an open dialogue with even our fiercest adversaries.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGGLEMAN), a veteran of the United States Air Force, who served in Operation Allied Force, Operation Enduring Freedom, and multiple counterterrorism activities over the past two decades.

We thank him for his service.

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I stand in strong opposition to this amendment.

Since I mission-planned the first bombing runs in Afghanistan in early 2001, warfare has evolved. It is fascinating to think that my military career started with dropping bombs.

One of my jobs was to flush out, bury, or kill insurgents who used caves as places for cover. Technology was certainly in use when utilizing GPS-guided weapons, electro-optical and laser-guided missiles. We mensurated coordinates by using systems like raindrop and tracked our aircrews with systems like combat track.

For us older warfighters and folks here, it was incredible then, but today it would be like playing tank war on an original Atari.

Terrorists still use caves, but those caves could be in cyberspace. By 2018, I was working on tracking targets through a myriad of activities, finding gaps in vertically integrated network infrastructures, linking proxy groups to IED resupply, perfecting telephony analysis, computer network attack and identifying network critical touchpoints in command and control architectures. I wasn't just dropping bombs anymore.

Instead of executing war, our group worked to determine as many asymmetric terrorist attack modalities as we could and then used research and development to advance new concepts, such as algorithmic warfare or instantaneous information sharing.

My job, in two decades, took me from bombs to algorithms.

This amendment is ill-timed and irresponsible and seems to coincide with impeachment. This act is political, without any forethought to what a possible AUMF would look like in this new era of asymmetric warfare.

We have Iran on the ropes, have killed their number one terrorist and struck their command and control hierarchy in a devastating way.

This amendment, at the bottom of page 2, states:

No Federal funds may be obligated or expended for any use of military force in or against Iran, unless Congress has declared war, enacted specific statutory authorization for such use of military force after the date of the enactment of this act that meets the requirement of the War Powers Resolution.

Let's ensure we enact specific statutory authorization or reason way before we remove statutory authority already in place.

Does this amendment restrict use of resources already in place if Iran employs cyberattack, critical infrastructure attack, electronic warfare, chemical attack, biological attack, or any other attack modalities that terrorists like to employ?

And what if terrorist-specific modalities can be used where Iran supports terror operations in places such as Iraq, Afghanistan, Lebanon, Algeria, Yemen, Bahrain; is the United States then limited to new resource allocation to defend forces?

The speed of warfare is intense. And let's make no mistake: Congress cannot always move at the speed of warfare in a time of asymmetric kinetic—think airplanes—or nonkinetic—think electric power infrastructure and military communications network—attack. That is why we have a Commander in Chief. That is why we have Article II of the Constitution. That is why our Founders made it this way. Sometimes military force is not war.

Of course we must preserve Article I powers. Let's approach this fix in a way that preserves our Constitution and considers the nongeographic threat posture we live in today.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that the President always has a legal right to defend America, U.S. forces and embassies, and this resolution explicitly exempts the defensive actions described in the War Powers Resolution.

The War Powers Resolution has been around since 1973, and it has never prevented the President from defending America.

Again, this amendment just enforces the text of the War Powers Resolution.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON), not only a Member of this body, but a combat veteran.

I thank him for his service.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

When I led marines in Iraq, they asked me a lot of questions. Some were simple, like: How do I send a letter home to my parents? Some were more difficult, like: What kind of rocket do I need to use against this building?

But the single hardest question I got was: Sir, why are we here? It came from marines of all backgrounds, all political stripes. And it was rooted in the fact that we got to Iraq care of a President who used false intelligence and a Congress that failed to do its job.

Too many Americans died in Iraq because we did not fulfill our constitutional responsibility.

Now, nothing in this amendment takes away the Commander in Chief's ability to defend ourselves; in fact, it cites the War Powers Resolution. But it does make it very clear that Congress has not authorized the President to go to war with Iran. That is a message that we need to send today.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. HAALAND).

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The President's reckless behavior unnecessarily escalated an already simmering conflict with Iran. The assassination of General Qasem Soleimani, without consulting Congress, led us to the brink of war.

While we have taken a step back from the ledge, the President's actions had severe and fatal consequences. Fifty of our brave servicemembers suffered traumatic brain injuries, and 176 innocent civilians on a commercial airline were tragically killed by retaliatory missile strikes.

Now is the time to reduce tensions and engage in good faith diplomacy. The American people have made it clear that we do not want a war with Iran.

It is long past time for Congress to reclaim its constitutional authority over the power to wage war. I urge my colleagues to do this by passing the No War Against Iran Act.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY), the distinguished chair of the Republican Conference.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MCCAUL for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the measures that we are voting on and debating today are unconstitutional, they are partisan, and they are dangerous for America's national security.

The House already debated and voted on both of these bills during the NDAA process last year. Both were rejected, rightly, and stripped from the final NDAA for a reason.

Now Speaker PELOSI is choosing to put this legislation on the floor once again in order to weaken the President just as the Democrats did with their unconstitutional War Powers Resolution earlier this month.

Speaker PELOSI and the House Democrats are so unsure of their own substantive case that they are hiding behind House rules to make sure that Republicans can't even bring any amendment to this legislation.

I wish this were a surprise, but it is, unfortunately, more of the same abuse of power we have become accustomed to under the Democratic majority in this House. Speaker PELOSI and the Democrats continue to demonstrate they hate the President so much that they will not even stand with him when he kills the world's deadliest terrorist. Representative KHANNA's measure today would tie the President's hands at a time when he needs flexibility most.

Earlier this month, Mr. Speaker, the President took action to protect American troops, to defend our national security, when he killed the terrorist Qasem Soleimani. His decisive strike against Soleimani made the world a safer place.

In carrying out this action, President Trump relied on several authorities, including his Article II powers and the 2002 AUMF, the measure my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are attempting to repeal today.

The bills before us will undermine the deterrence established by President Trump. They will embolden Iran. They will make conflict more, not less, likely.

Weakness, Mr. Speaker, is provocative, and both of these measures convey weakness.

Representative KHANNA's bill is a serious constitutional transgression:

It would call into question whether the President could defend our closest ally in the Middle East, Israel, without first getting approval from 535 Members of the House and the Senate;

It would call into question whether he could protect our diplomats in Iraq, who have just, in recent months, faced attacks from Iranian-backed militias;

It would call into question whether he could uphold the basic principle of freedom of navigation and defend against Iran's attacks on international shipping.

Our troops are fighting today, Mr. Speaker, to protect the freedom of every person in this Chamber and every person across this country. They should never have to question whether they can defend themselves against America's enemies, but Representative KHANNA's measure would sow exactly this kind of doubt.

This bill ignores a key historical reality: Iran has been at war with the United States for four decades. The regime has been designated the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism for years on end. Hundreds of troops have died at the hands of Iranian-backed militias.

As the U.S. faces these adversaries, it is absolutely critical that the President retain the flexibility to act swiftly and decisively when our interests or forces are threatened.

It is time for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to stop playing politics with the security of our Nation. I urge my colleagues to vote against these measures today.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me say that America's Constitution laws don't really convey weakness. Enforcing those laws is what keeps America strong. And when any President does not follow the law, this Congress must act, and that is what we are trying to do now.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Well, hating all things Obama, Trump impulsively tore up the nuclear

deal with Iran, even though all of his intelligence agencies, all of the other signatories, the inspectors, agreed they were in compliance.

□ 1000

He said he would get a better deal as a master negotiator, through a unilateral campaign of maximum pressure, and bring stability to the region.

Instead, he has triggered steadily escalating tensions, culminating in the January 3 assassination of Soleimani, bringing the U.S. to the brink of war with Iran.

The Bush invasion of Iraq under phony intelligence provided by Vice President Cheney was the worst foreign policy mistake in the history of the United States of America, and we are still seeing the repercussions, but a war with Iran would be worse.

Trump says he doesn't need to consult with Congress for a war in Iran. We hear from the other side that Congress asserting its constitutional authority regarding declaration of war is dangerous.

I tell you what is dangerous: an impulsive Commander in Chief embroiling the United States in yet another endless war in the Middle East.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, Trump has no plan, no strategy in the Middle East, but this self-described "stable genius," who tells us he is smarter than our generals, smarter than our military and intelligence leaders, he wants sole control over whether our Nation is plunged into a war with Iran.

Today, we say: No, Mr. President. You are not yet the tyrant that you wish to become. You defied military judgment by rejecting the Iran nuclear agreement. You abruptly abandoned our Kurdish allies, so vital to the fight against ISIS and terrorism, and you have taken us to the brink of war with an assassination of a foreign leader without any imminent threat demonstrated, only double-talk to explain that assassination.

It is time to put the brakes on his dangerous pursuits.

We reject this reckless and impulsive escalation, the endless bloodshed, and the lack of vision beyond promoting his own selfish interests.

It is Congress that our Constitution vests with responsibility to declare war.

If 1776 stood for anything, it was that America would not be ruled by a king or one who today aspires to be an authoritarian.

This legislation will cut off funds for future war with Iran unless Congress authorizes war, has a specific authorization, or we face a true, genuine imminent threat.

Before young Americans are again placed in harm's way, let's be sure it is the only choice to ensure our security and have a strategy for victory.

Today, let's set the groundwork for peace, not more architecture for endless war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Members are further reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WATKINS), a veteran of the United States Army with 8 years of combat service in the Middle East.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) for yielding.

With respect to my friend from Massachusetts, Representative MOULTON, I was asked tough questions in the Middle East as well by my soldiers. I was asked: "How do we kill our enemy?" And I was asked, perhaps more jarring: "How do we live and go home?"

We need two things on the front lines. We need speed, and we need lethality. This body has proven itself incapable of empowering our troops to act with speed and lethality.

Operations are dangerous. When I went out doing combat and rebuilding operations on the front lines in two conflict environments, I was very noticeable, Mr. Speaker. I am a White guy. I am pretty upfront about that. But you better believe that they know I was a soft target. It is important for my own survivability that, should anything happen to me, they know that a Reaper drone is going to rain a Hellfire missile down on them.

That is deterrence. That works far better than appeasement.

I would also like to add that we talked a lot about the process. Supposedly, we are attacking the process and not reality. Well, the reality is that I have had friends of mine tortured to death, friends of mine I knew very well in conflict environments.

It is in their spirit that I say this. This is awful, what we are doing. We need to empower our Commander in Chief. Despite your hatred of his policy, we need to empower him to act with decisiveness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of Congress Member KHANNA's resolution to prevent any funds from being used for an unauthorized war with Iran.

Just a few weeks ago, America and Iran were on the brink of a terrible and destructive conflict. Fortunately, both sides stepped back, but the tensions and volatility remain.

Make no mistake, Iran continues to be a challenge and continues to threaten U.S. interests in the region. However, as the Iran nuclear deal demonstrated, conflict is not inevitable.

But with a President committed to a campaign of maximum pressure, we cannot simply wait for the next crisis and hope for the best. That is why we must reclaim Congress' constitutional authority to declare war and prevent the President from leading us into a war of choice.

Already, the House passed a bipartisan War Powers Resolution to force the President to seek congressional authorization for any war with Iran. Today's resolution would help enforce that by prohibiting the use of funds for an unauthorized war.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. ENGEL for yielding.

We can agree Iran is the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism and must not be allowed to obtain a nuclear weapon, but let's also agree that diplomacy is preferred, instead of armed conflict.

But the question today is not whether to go to war but who has the power to make that decision.

Mr. Speaker, our family was blessed when my son, a United States marine war veteran, came home safely from tours in Iraq and Afghanistan, but too many loved ones were not that lucky. So when I came to Congress, I made a promise never to send someone else's child to a war that could be avoided.

The constitutional law gives Congress, not the President, the sole power to declare and authorize war, and it is time that Congress owns up to that grave responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to have the courage to repeal the war authorization against Iraq and tell the President no war against Iran without our consent.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WALTZ), a U.S. Army veteran and decorated Special Forces officer with 23 years of service, including combat tours in Afghanistan and the Middle East.

Mr. WALTZ. Mr. Speaker, today, and as the underlying premise for this legislation, we are hearing a lot of things.

Number one, we are hearing that the President recklessly escalated our relationship with Iran. Wrong. The President responded to a series of escalations from Iran, and he responded responsibly.

Our issues with Iran, this relationship, didn't start just in the last few months. It started in 1979. It started with Iranians taking our diplomats hostage. It continued with them sponsoring the suicide attack on our Embassy in Beirut, with killing hundreds of marines in Beirut, with bombing the Khobar Towers, with killing hundreds of Americans in Iraq at the hands of its militias, and on and on.

Most recently, after the Iranians attacked international shipping, attacked global oil supplies in Saudi Arabia, stormed our Embassy and killed yet another American, finally, the President responded by taking down the mastermind of many of these attacks over the years in a way that was limited, that was precise, and that had zero collateral damage.

The other thing you are going to hear is that this attack on Soleimani, the killing of Soleimani, the head of the Quds Force, was disproportional. I have to tell you, the families of the tens of thousands of people across the Middle East that Soleimani and his militias have killed, they didn't think it was proportional. They thought it was long overdue. The Gold Star families, the American Gold Star families who no longer have their loved ones with them holiday after holiday, they didn't think it was disproportional. They too thought it was long overdue.

Soleimani should have been killed years ago. I am grateful the President finally took action.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues how many more Americans, how many more families, should go without their loved ones at the hands of this serial human rights abuser before the President should take action?

In fact, I, as a Member of Congress, would have been pounding the table had he not taken action, given actionable intelligence and the opportunity to do so.

You are hearing that the President assassinated a foreign leader. Also wrong. A terrorist is a terrorist, and this individual was designated a terrorist by the Obama administration. The Quds Force is a terrorist organization, as decided by the Obama administration.

Whether it is al-Qaida and Osama bin Laden, whether it is ISIS and Baghdadi, or whether it is the Quds Force and Soleimani, we have an obligation to strike back at terrorism and to stop terrorism in its tracks. The President had a duty and a responsibility as Commander in Chief to take this action.

Finally, you are hearing that the administration has no strategy. Also wrong. The administration withdrew from the Iran deal. It was a bad deal, narrowly focused on one aspect of its program.

Its maximum pressure campaign is in place.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. WALTZ. The Iranian economy is tanking. They came to the table in the first place in 2012 to enter into negotiations because the sanctions were working, and they will come to the table again. But this time, this administration will strike a better deal that encompasses terrorism, its missile program, and the fact that Iran is still taking American hostages to this day.

Then, we will get the entirety of its nuclear program in a much better deal.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to step away from this partisan bill, to vote against these bills coming to the table, and to support the administration in taking on the world's leading sponsor of terrorism.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that if killing Soleimani was about retaliating for past bad acts by Iran, that is exactly when the law requires the President to work with the Congress for a response, not do a response on his own.

The President didn't work with us. Instead, he told the American people there was an imminent threat, with no evidence to support that claim.

Now, I don't like the Iranian regime. There are lots of things I don't like about them. But it doesn't mean that we just give any President a blank check to do whatever he wants to start a war.

We have been through that in the past decades of endless war, with this body, as far as I am concerned, abrogating its responsibility and essentially giving the administrations of both parties blank checks.

This is about Congress reasserting what it is supposed to do. This is about Congress saying only we have the power to declare war; the President does not have that power to declare war.

□ 1015

Now, the Khanna measure is about enforcing current law as it is written in the War Powers Resolution. We should not create special loopholes in current law for any one country, no matter how close our alliance or partnership is. This is not a question of whether we will defend our allies and partners. It is a question of which branch of government is responsible for making that decision.

The War Powers Resolution could not be more clear. It is Congress who is responsible for authorizing the use of military force. We went through the entire Cold War without ever creating an exception to the War Powers Resolution or the Constitution when it comes to Article 5 of the NATO treaty. We do not need to create a loophole now.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me say something that I have been saying a lot recently. Nobody denies the fact that Iran is a bad actor. No one denies the fact that Iran is the leading state sponsor of terrorism in the world. No one is saying that the Iranian regime is a good regime or a regime that doesn't threaten our interests. They do threaten our interests.

I am not a naive person. I don't like the regime, and I know what they do. But we have a way of responding, and it is not to give any President a blank check to do whatever he or she may want to do.

Congress declares war according to the Constitution; not the President. Congress declares war. And today we are attempting to take back the authorization that is given to us in the United States Constitution and say to this President and to every President that comes in the future: No blank checks for war.

We gave blank checks for the past 20 years, and we have been involved in one mistake after another. This is simply saying for Congress to reassert its authority. I am not saying that in the future there may not be a different decision, but the decision that should always remain the same is that Congress has the power to declare war; not the President. Congress.

I think my friends on the other side of the aisle somehow forget that. They make some good points. But, again, I say, it comes back to this Congress to declare a war, and we are today taking that responsibility, grabbing the bull by the horns and saying: Enough is enough, where Congress just sits idly by and has no say except to rubberstamp whatever administration wants to go to war.

That should stop today, and that is why we are moving ahead with this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. Cicilline).

Mr. Cicilline. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of both the amendments to H.R. 550 under consideration today. I thank the Speaker for her courage in bringing these bills to the floor, and I thank the sponsors, my friends, BARBARA LEE and RO KHANNA for their leadership.

It is long past time for the 2002 AUMF to be repealed. This vaguely worded authorization of force against Iraq, which was obtained under false pretenses by the George W. Bush administration, has long posed a problem for proper congressional oversight, though at various points in time, both parties have shied away from taking action to rectify this.

But now we have no choice but to act, as the Trump administration argues that the 2002 AUMF which justifies war against Saddam Hussein's Iraq apparently applies to members of the Iranian Government, even though the word "Iran" appears nowhere in the text.

As Congress, we must assert our constitutional oversight authority in matters of war. Permitting this and future administrations to rely on an open-

ended authorization of force without proper oversight, is nothing less than an abrogation of our duty.

I urge each of my colleagues to support this amendment and final passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Rhode Island an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. Cicilline. Madam Speaker, if I may just respond to some arguments that this will undermine our rights to self-defense. The President always has a legal right to defend America and defend U.S. forces and embassies. This resolution explicitly exempts the defensive actions described in the War Powers Resolution.

The War Powers Resolution has been around since 1973 and has never prevented the President from defending America. So that argument simply is baseless, and I urge all of my colleagues to support both of these excellent amendments.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. McCaul. Madam Speaker, we have no more speakers, and I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, it is now my honor to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his courageous leadership in bringing this important legislation to the floor.

I commend the two makers of the resolutions, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and Congressman RO KHANNA for their exceptional leadership, and I urge a positive vote on this important legislation.

Just to put it in some perspective, as Members of Congress, our first responsibility is to keep the American people safe, and that includes both our servicemembers abroad and our families at home. Three weeks ago, this House honored that duty by passing the War Powers Resolution to limit the President's military actions regarding Iran.

We all salute Congresswoman SLOTKIN for her leadership in putting that forth. Now we are taking additional steps to protect American lives and values by passing two strong pieces of legislation: Congresswoman BARBARA LEE's legislation to repeal the 2002 Iraq Authorization for the Use of Military Force, AUMF, and Congressman RO KHANNA's legislation to prohibit funding for military action against Iran not authorized by Congress.

We thank them for their longstanding leadership to protect American lives, and we thank all Members who have worked tirelessly on this priority, including Congresswoman ESHOO

who had similar legislation in this regard.

Members of Congress continue to have serious, urgent concerns about the President's decision to engage in hostilities against Iran and about its lack of strategy moving forward. Let us just stipulate that we all agree that Iran is a bad actor; that they treat their people terribly; that they are a menace to the region; and that we have sanctions against them for their spreading of technologies and other resources to terrorists in the region.

We don't want them to have a nuclear weapon, and I think that the President's decision to withdraw from the nuclear agreement was wrong, but that is not on the floor today. What is on the floor today is for us to, again, honor our constitutional responsibility to protect and defend—we take that oath—but also to honor our responsibilities, the power to declare war that is written into the Constitution for the Congress.

Over time, that has been, shall we say, usurped by administrations, both Democratic and Republican, and now, to an extent that practically abrogates whatever is in the Constitution.

This morning a YouGov poll said that 60 percent of the American people oppose war with Iran and 68 percent want to remove all troops from Iraq.

There is no appetite for war in our country. I was stunned recently to be with a delegation in observance of the 75th anniversary of the end of the victory at the Battle of the Bulge, a very decisive battle in World War II. There were 19,000 Americans who died in that war.

There were all of the heads of state present, but the VIPs for us were the veterans who were there; some of them now, 75 years later, in their 90s, but still vigorous. One of them who spoke for the veterans talked about the band of brothers and the allies, that there was multilateralism, and the horrors of war, and the glory of that victory. But at the end of his speech he said: "Maybe I shouldn't say this, but I will. I urge all of you to pray for peace."

I spoke to him afterward and thanked him for that and he said: "It is so important."

Even our President Kennedy who said that we will fight any foe, pay any price—what he said in his inaugural address—he has said that unless men end war, war will end men.

So we have to be very careful about how we engage in protecting the American people and remove all doubt in anybody's mind that we will. Think of me as a lioness. If you come near our cubs, you are dead.

So this is not about not understanding our responsibility and our strength. But as warriors, that gives us even more power to be peacekeepers. All we are saying is: Let's do this carefully and not in a way that escalates.

I remember after that weekend I got the call from the administration confirming that we had made the attack

on Soleimani—who was a terrible person, no doubt about that—and I said: "Well, why did you not inform the Gang of Eight as you were required to do?"

That Gang of Eight are the four leaders, House and Senate, Democrats and Republicans; and the four leaders of the Intelligence Committee, House and Senate, Democrats and Republicans.

"Why did you not inform the Gang of Eight?"

And their response was: "We really had to keep this close."

You wanted to keep it "close" from not honoring your responsibility of notifying or consulting with the Congress of the United States?

I didn't expect to hear that from the chairman of the Joint Chiefs. I did probably expect to hear it from the Secretary of Defense. But that cannot be the way we proceed. Congress has the constitutional responsibility.

The administration has a responsibility, too, and we respect that. And that is why when we redid the War Powers Act it was respectful of the power of the President, but also the power of the Congress of the United States.

They failed to appropriately notify the Congress. Then the President issued an insufficient War Powers Act notification that raised more questions than it answered, and it was classified in its entirety, leaving the public in the dark about our national security.

When the President finally briefed Congress, their own party Members described the briefing as "insulting and demeaning" with one GOP Senator saying it was the "worst briefing I have ever seen."

When the President asked me if I agreed with that characterization, I said: "There is stiff competition for the worst classified briefing we have ever seen from this administration."

And now it appears that the President may have even misled Congress and the public about the threats facing our troops related to this conflict. For 2 weeks, the President insisted there were zero injuries or casualties from Iran's attack on our military bases, contradicting multiple news reports.

But over the past week, the administration has admitted that there were injuries, first reporting 11 servicemembers who were diagnosed with traumatic brain injury, TBI, and then 34 and now 50 of our troops. TBI, as defined by the National Institutes of Health is: "... damage to the brain, whether from impact, penetrating objects, blast waves or rapid movement of the brain within the skull" and is a leading cause of death and disability for Americans.

This serious injury is understood in both the military and medical communities to be the "signature wound" and the "silent epidemic" of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq.

□ 1030

Yet the President minimizes our soldiers' wounds saying:

I heard they had headaches and a couple of other things, but I can say and I can report it, not very serious.

Not very serious? That is not what the Veterans of Foreign Wars says.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars put out a statement saying they expect an apology from POTUS. TBI is a serious injury and not one that can be taken lightly.

Madam Speaker, I include their statement for the RECORD.

VFW EXPECTS APOLOGY FROM POTUS

[January 24, 2020]

KANSAS CITY, MO.—"In light of today's announcement from the defense department that 34 U.S. service members suffered traumatic brain injuries as a result of Iran's retaliatory strike and President Trump's remarks which minimized these troops' injuries, the Veterans of Foreign Wars cannot stand idle on this matter.

TBI is a serious injury and one that cannot be taken lightly. TBI is known to cause depression, memory loss, severe headaches, dizziness and fatigue—all injuries that come with both short- and long-term effects.

The VFW expects an apology from the president to our service men and women for his misguided remarks. And, we ask that he and the White House join with us in our efforts to educate Americans of the dangers TBI has on these heroes as they protect our great nation in these trying times. Our warriors require our full support more than ever in this challenging environment."—William "Doc" Schmitz, VFW National Commander

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, Americans have a choice: to keep the American people safe or to enable the administration's dangerous escalation which is happening again without the consent of Congress or the knowledge of the public.

We want to see a strategy. What is the purpose? What is the mission? What is the strategy involved in this?

Madam Speaker, I urge the President to work with Congress to advance an immediate and effective deescalatory strategy that prevents further violence.

Our brave servicemen and -women, their families, and all Americans deserve smart, strong, and strategic action, not the administration's reckless and rash policies. Therefore, again, I urge our colleagues to support the Khanna amendment and the Barbara Lee amendment.

I thank them for their leadership. I thank Chairman ENGEL for the moderation that he has brought to this, the experience that he has in terms of war, in terms of peace, and in terms of Congress' role in our foreign affairs.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, as I have said repeatedly, I am strongly in favor of exercising our solemn Article I authority for matters of war and peace; but we are not at war with Iran, we are not engaged in hostilities, and the President is not trying to start a war with Iran.

I have been in the White House, and I have heard him say this personally. In fact, he has shown incredible restraint against Iran after they shot

down our drone, after they hit 50 percent of the Saudi oil fields, after they killed an American, and after they wounded four soldiers.

My Democratic colleagues know very well there are many situations short of war which require military action. In fact, they supported President Obama's thousands of unauthorized strikes in Libya which were not even related to the protection of Americans overseas.

I believe it is hypocritical and dangerous for the majority to tie this President's hands in responding to the very real and growing threats that Iran and its proxies pose to Americans in the Middle East. As I said, they killed an American contractor and they launched a massive attack against our Embassy in Baghdad.

For those Members who think it was a minor brush against the Embassy, look at these photos. Look at the damage that was done to our United States Embassy. It is absolutely disgraceful.

Soleimani had an imminent plot when he went to Damascus, Lebanon, and Baghdad to meet with his number two guy to go to the Ayatollah to get the green light to get out further operations to kill diplomats and American soldiers. The idea that that strike on Soleimani was not justified, I don't know what more evidence was required than this.

Then, after this, they launched anti-ballistic missiles against United States military bases. They launched dozens of ballistic missiles at U.S. Forces, causing, as the Speaker said, traumatic brain injury in at least 50 U.S. servicemen.

Again, what more do we need?

It is unconscionable at this point in time, with this happening at this time in history, to limit the President's ability to respond as needed to protect American lives from this vicious regime. This time I think the Democrats have gone too far.

Like President Reagan said, I believe in peace through strength, and it is my sincere hope that we will not need to launch another strike like the President did against Qasem Soleimani, but it did make the world a safer place.

Unfortunately, the enemy also gets a vote. If Iran doubts our resolve to respond forcefully, then it will surely affect their calculus moving forward about whether to attack America again.

In opposing this amendment, I am standing with the Iranian people. It is important that they hear this. I know they are hearing this because I have so many Iranian friends who tell me that what we say here in this Chamber means something. The people of Iran are listening, and when they see a divided Congress, that sends the worst message at the absolute worst time.

I want to let the American citizens there in the Middle East know that they deserve to be covered by the umbrella of our great men and women in uniform. They deserve the protection of our government. If their lives are

threatened, I do not view them as a hypothetical. They are real people representing our country abroad, and I will not let them be vulnerable.

So, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment for the second time this Congress because it divides the Nation and sends a wrong message at the wrong time to the people of Iran.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, for too many years, Congress has allowed administration after administration after administration to sideline us in critical foreign policy matters. It is time we said enough is enough, particularly when it comes to when and where the United States military is engaged around the world.

As I have said before, if killing Soleimani was about retaliating for past bad acts by Iran, then that is exactly when the law requires the President to work with Congress. The President didn't work with us. Instead, he told the American people there was an imminent threat with no evidence to support that claim, once again moving ahead and making Congress irrelevant.

We have seen that done with Chief Executives of both parties, and it is time we stood up and said: No, enough is enough; only Congress can declare war.

I know I sound like a broken record, but I think that is the crucial spot of what we are talking about here. Congress cannot just be swept along for the ride. Congress has the power to declare war.

The American people are sick of perpetual war. If we don't do everything in our power to make sure this administration cannot plunge us into another war that we don't want, then we will have let the American people down.

Again, for too many years, Congress has allowed administration after administration after administration to sideline us on critical foreign policy matters; and, again, it is time to say enough is enough. That is what we are attempting to do today, and that is why I urge my colleagues to support this very important bill.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CROW. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the bills offered by Representatives LEE and KHANNA to reassert Congress's constitutional role in authorizing the use of military force.

It was an honor to serve my country in Iraq and Afghanistan, but I also witnessed the consequences of sending Americans into harm's way without defined goals and a clear exit strategy.

For the past 17 years, that authorization has sent hundreds of thousands of American men and women to war in Iraq. We are now faced with the prospect of another confrontation in the Middle East, this time with Iran, that risks repeating some of the mistakes of the past.

The most solemn responsibility of Congress is the decision to send our men and women into harm's way. Authorizations granted by Congress should be revoked once the original purpose has ended. But Congress has allowed authorizations to live far past their intended life and abdicated its Constitutional authority in matters of war and diplomacy. Until now.

The bills offered by my colleagues reclaim Congress's constitutional role in determining when we send our sons, daughters, mothers, and fathers to fight on our behalf. They ensure that the American people have a voice in making such significant decisions. Through the leadership of my colleagues, this chamber is ensuring that any future use of military force must be subject to the rigorous debate the American people expect.

I applaud the leadership of Representatives LEE and KHANNA on this important issue and I urge my colleagues to join me in reasserting Congress's role in deciding when to use military force by voting yes on these bills.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2456, a resolution to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002.

Madam Speaker, the President's interpretation of the 2002 AUMF as a blank check for military intervention in the Middle East is certainly troublesome. It is because of this abuse that the United States has been involved in a seemingly endless conflict in the region, as demonstrated in the Administration's justification for the recent strikes in Iran.

A repeal of the 2002 AUMF is a step in the right direction towards ending the cycle of military interventionism in the Middle East. Our foreign policy must instead be guided by diplomacy and collective dialogue; only with military action as a last resort can we build peace in the region.

This bill will send a clear message to the President that the power to declare war begins and ends in Congress. I plan to vote in favor of it and would urge my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 811, the previous question is ordered on this portion of the divided question.

The question is: Will the House concur in the Senate amendment with the House amendment specified in section 4(a) of House Resolution 811?

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

Pursuant to House Resolution 811, the portion of the divided question comprising the amendment specified in section 4(b) of House Resolution 811 shall now be considered.

The text of House amendment to Senate amendment specified in section 4(b) of House Resolution 811 is as follows:

In the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the Senate, strike sections 4 and 5 and insert the following:

TITLE II—REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002

SEC. 201. REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002.

The Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) is hereby repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This portion shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, let me start by thanking my friend, Representative LEE from California, for her hard work on this amendment. As you know, she is the newest newlywed in the House of Representatives, so we congratulate her on a great new marriage and wish her and her husband a long life together.

She is a principled, passionate leader when it comes to standing up for Congress' role and responsibility in foreign affairs, particularly war powers. I am proud to be a cosponsor of her legislation. I am glad we are able to partner on such an important issue.

Madam Speaker, it has been nearly two decades since the House voted to authorize the war in Iraq. I wish we could have that vote to do over again knowing what we know now. We were led into war on phony intelligence and found our brave servicemembers bogged down there for years at such tragic costs.

The war is over, and it is long past time that the authority Congress granted to fight that war should be removed from the books—because we see how it is being misused.

Earlier this month we heard the argument that the Iraq war authorization would justify military action against Iran. Here is how the argument goes:

The executive branch says that this authorization can be used to deal with any threat emanating—I stress the word, “emanating”—from Iraq. Yes, you heard it right, emanating from Iraq.

That is just wrong. It is not what the authorization says. It is not what Congress intended when it passed that resolution. I was here. I remember it. It dealt with threats coming from Saddam Hussein's Iraq. Saddam Hussein is dead. His government and regime are long gone.

This war authorization has no relevance to present-day Iraq, and it should be repealed. It should not be used to launch more military action.

Now, we will likely hear an argument that repealing the Iraq war resolution would undermine our ability to combat

terrorism around the world. But let's be clear about something: the Iraq war resolution—what we are seeking to repeal today—was never intended to authorize our fight against ISIS or other associated terrorist groups, and it is not needed as authorization for any of these operations.

There is another existing authorization for the use of military force, the measure that Congress passed after 9/11 to deal with al-Qaida. I don't agree with the administration's overly expansive interpretation of the 9/11 AUMF. I think they have stretched it well beyond what Congress ever intended. But even this administration has said clearly that they can continue current counterterrorism operation using the post-9/11 authorization even if we repeal the 2002 Iraq war authorization.

The only time this administration has pointed to the 2002 Iraq war authorization as its only source of congressional authority is the strike against Soleimani, something Congress never intended. We cannot allow this President or any President to claim Congress has already authorized him to attack Iranian officials.

If the President wants to use military force against Iran, then he has to come to Congress, plain and simple. An administration certainly shouldn't be twisting a decades-old authorization to justify plunging us into a war the American people don't want and that Congress has not authorized.

I get back to what I said before: Only Congress can declare war, not the President, and we have had violation after violation after violation about this important matter. It is time that Congress reassert its constitutional role in declaring war or not declaring war, so it is long past time that we repeal this outdated war authorization. The House has already voted to do so with bipartisan support.

I hope all of my colleagues will join me in supporting this measure and taking these important steps in reclaiming Congress' authority over war powers.

I thank Ms. LEE, who has the foresight to be courageous and stand all alone because she believes something is right. That is what we are trying to do now. We are trying to do what is right, what is right for our country.

Again, what is right for our country is that Congress needs to grab the bull by the horns. Congress has the authority to declare war, not the President, not any President—Congress. We are reclaiming Congress' authority over war powers the way it was intended.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1045

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I strongly oppose repealing the Authorization for Use of Military Force to “defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq.”

We should not be repealing current counterterrorism authorities unless and until we have replaced them with an updated AUMF that clearly allows us to confront the enemies that continue to threaten our Nation, our people, and our allies.

As I have stated before, I would prefer a new, updated AUMF. But in the 13 months our Democratic colleagues have been in charge, we have seen no such proposal from the majority. In fact, they haven't even started that conversation.

None of us want to see the extension of any conflict beyond what is necessary, but we also have learned that premature disengagement can have huge costs, such as when the Obama administration's rush to withdraw U.S. troops out of Iraq contributed to the deadly rise of ISIS in Iraq and Syria and the formation of the caliphate.

The 2002 Iraq AUMF was not only used against Saddam Hussein; it also identified al-Qaida and “other international terrorist organizations, including organizations that threaten the lives and safety of United States citizens.”

So those on the other side who say this only applies to Saddam Hussein, that is absolutely incorrect. It applies to international terrorist organizations like al-Qaida.

Members will recall that al-Qaida in Iraq later became ISIS, a brutal transnational terrorist organization that continues to threaten American lives and interests in our homeland. And for that reason, President Obama used the 2002 AUMF as legal authority for his military operations against ISIS in Iraq.

The current administration opposes repealing the 2002 AUMF because it “remains an important source of additional authority for military operations against ISIS in Iraq and to defend the national security of the United States against threats emanating from Iraq.”

As my colleagues know, these vital counter-ISIS operations continue. Repealing that authorization without a replacement endangers not only the United States' national security, but our coalition partners, most notably, Iraq.

The 2002 AUMF was most recently invoked for our January 2 strike on Qasem Soleimani, Iran's mastermind of terror, who killed more than 600 Americans, wounded thousands more, and orchestrated the fiery New Year's attack on the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad. It was a targeted, defensive strike in Iraq against a designated terrorist by the Obama administration who threatened U.S. Forces inside Iraq.

In the 2 months beforehand, Soleimani and his proxies launched a dozen attacks against U.S. personnel in Iraq, killing one American and wounding four U.S. servicemen near Kirkuk on December 27. And then, furthermore, as we saw in the photographs

from the previous argument, the Embassy was attacked in a very strong way.

I don't know what more evidence the President needed to respond under Article II in self-defense than this, Madam Speaker. And if he did not do so, he would be derelict in his responsibility.

And if he didn't stop the plot that we know Soleimani was getting ready to move forward after he went to Damascus and Lebanon and Baghdad to go to the Ayatollah to get the green light to kill more Americans and diplomats, then what would the American people say?

What if we had a storm on the Embassy like in 1979, then what?

I think the President was restrained. I think he did the right thing at the right time. It was an appropriate use of this AUMF, which states that Iraq "poses a continuing threat to the national security of the United States . . . by, among other things . . . harboring terrorist organizations."

Contrary to some of the rhetoric we heard 3 weeks ago, the administration does not claim that the 2002 AUMF gives them a blank check—as we have heard quite a bit on the other side—to attack Iran.

To the contrary—this is very important—the administration, and the President has told me personally, they have stated publicly that it has never interpreted the 2002 Iraq AUMF to provide authority for strikes inside of Iran or for war with Iran. Soleimani was in Baghdad, designated by Obama as a terrorist.

The President is also not seeking war with Iran. He has said this time and time again, and he gets misquoted on this time and time again.

The President has shown great restraint time and again after Iran's increasing provocations. I was actually quite surprised, after our U.S. military drones were struck down, there wasn't a response. And as he told the Nation and the world, he wants a deal that allows Iran to thrive and prosper.

Repealing this AUMF does not retroactively remove the President's ability to order his justified and limited strike on Soleimani. A repeal standing alone will only send the wrong message to our troops, our partners, our enemies, and our terrorist adversaries in Iraq.

To be sure, the 2002 AUMF should be replaced with new authorities—after all, it is almost 20 years old—that reflect current circumstances and provide our men and women in uniform with clear support for their critical missions that protect us. And it also gives the American people a voice in that.

I deeply regret that my colleagues are not serious enough about exercising our Article I authority to put forward a real, updated alternative to counter the persistent terrorist threats that we see in Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere.

Therefore, I see today's effort as nothing more than a political message

that does nothing to that end. It ties the hands of the President at a time when he is responsibly facing down a very dangerous Iranian regime, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the largest state sponsor of terrorism, that lives by the motto, "Death to America."

These critical constitutional issues of war and peace deserve better than that. I think if we are serious, we will work on both sides of the aisle. I know my Conference has great interest in working on a modernized 2002 AUMF, and I hope the other side can join us in that effort in the following year.

But, with respect to this, with no replacement, it would be very dangerous. It would tie our hands' ability to attack ISIS in Iraq. I think it is ill-advised, and, for that reason, I oppose it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), the newlywed and author of this important amendment.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, first let me thank the chairman of our Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. ENGEL, for his kind words of congratulations and also for his persistent and steady leadership on this issue and so many issues.

I also want to take a moment to thank Speaker PELOSI; Majority Leader HOYER; our whip, Mr. CLYBURN; and also Congresswoman JAYAPAL and Congressman POCAN. And I have to give a shout-out to my staff; our legislative director, Emma Mehrabi; my chief of staff, Julie Nickson; all of Team LEE; Mr. ENGEL's staff; all of our staffs who have come together, who have exhibited such an unwavering dedication and patriotism on this issue.

My bipartisan amendment before us today, Madam Speaker, would repeal the 2002 Iraq Authorization for Use of Military Force, AUMF.

It is important to note that nearly 75 percent of current Members were not serving when this AUMF was passed in 2002. I have long fought to repeal this. And what we knew then is that the 2003 invasion of Iraq was based on lies told by our own executive branch.

Let me remind you now that, in 2002, I stood here and urged us not to rush into war. I offered an amendment to the AUMF that was presented that would have prevented the war by requiring the inspectors to allow verifiable information with regard to the alleged weapons of mass destruction before we took military action.

That amendment received 72 votes. But had it passed, it would have exposed the false intelligence that the war was based on. There were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. That is what the 2002 authorization authorized and was about.

So I stand here once again urging Congress to do its job, this time by repealing the long-outdated and unnecessary 2002 AUMF. Not only is it not needed for any current counterterrorism operations, but repealing it would

have absolutely no impact on the administration's ongoing military operations.

Let me be clear: Congress passed the 2002 AUMF to address the perceived threat posed by the regime of Saddam Hussein. U.S. military deployments and operations carried out under this AUMF, dubbed Operation Iraqi Freedom, officially ended in 2011. Almost 18 years after the resolution's passage, the United States recognizes the sovereignty of Iraq and considers the Iraqi Government a key ally.

Madam Speaker, leaving this authorization on the books is both dangerous and irresponsible. Doing so would allow any administration to use it for military action that Congress never intended to authorize. It will continue to allow these wars without end.

Congress must make clear that any President must seek specific authorization for the use of force against Iran or any country. The 2002 AUMF was specifically authorized to rid Iraq of weapons of mass destruction which did not exist. That is why this is so important and something that we have already voted on, as our chairman indicated.

Make no mistake: We are here today to rein in this President and any President, rein in their abuse of executive power, and to make clear that Congress has the sole constitutional duty to declare war and authorize the use of force.

This should not be a partisan issue. Part of that responsibility is in ensuring that authorizations do not remain indefinitely, leaving them subject to use far outside those which Congress intended.

For example, the Trump administration has said that the 2002 AUMF has been used to justify attacks on Iran. These arguments have absolutely no basis in reality, underscoring the need for immediate action by Congress. That is why the outdated AUMF must be repealed, to prevent further abuse by this administration. We can't allow any irrational decisionmaking to drag us into an unnecessary and catastrophic war of choice in the Middle East.

And, Madam Speaker, let me just remind you of this. As the daughter of a veteran who served valiantly in two wars, I know personally the cost and consequences of war. I know that they are grave.

Several thousands of our brave servicemen were killed, thousands more have permanent injuries, seen and unseen. We have witnessed the horrific rise of suicide and deep strains placed on our military families, and we must always remember the tens of thousands of Iraqis killed as well and trillions of taxpayer dollars spent.

Of course, the unnecessary U.S. invasion of Iraq also sparked, yes, the rise of ISIS and allowed Iran to establish a presence in Iraq.

Madam Speaker, we all know that our top priority is to protect our national security, our brave troops, our

allies, and the American people. It is past time to finally exercise our constitutional duty and muster the courage to vote on matters of war and peace.

Madam Speaker, I again thank Mr. ENGEL and my colleagues, and I urge them to vote "yes" on this amendment.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), whose four decades of uniformed service to our Nation included 40 combat missions in Iraq before his retirement last year as a general in the United States Army.

□ 1100

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Madam Speaker, it wasn't part of my remarks, but from my standpoint, when I was in Iraq, we found weapons of mass destruction, so let's just make that part of the RECORD.

None of us want to be in a war with Iran, with Iraq, with anybody, for that matter—and that includes the President. None of us want that. And many of us on this side agree with our colleagues that this needs to be updated to reflect current circumstances, current enemy capabilities, and different tactics, techniques, and procedures used by our enemy. But I wonder where my colleagues in this Congress have been. They would have you believe that they were impotent, that they were helpless, unable to do anything about this.

I listened to the Speaker's remarks, and she said the President didn't inform her of the strike against Soleimani. For 8 years, Madam Speaker, nearly 4,000 people were taken off the planet by the previous administration. Do the math; that is over one a day. I wonder if the Speaker got a call every single day that said: "We are going to take this terrorist off the battlefield." I highly doubt that.

The question is about how we are going to change the policy, because like I said, many of us agree the policy needs to be updated. I would hope that this Congress, that any Congress, has the courage to understand that when we sent our finest into battle in Iraq, that they are fighting two enemies, but we are only allowed to engage one.

Right now, as we speak, we have servicemembers in Iraq that are depending on us to have their backs. But what are we going to do? We are going to rip the rug right out from underneath their feet because suddenly, under this administration, Congress suddenly has the courage.

I offered an AUMF 7 years ago and talked to my friends on the other side of the aisle. They didn't want to talk about it at all, nothing.

Our servicemembers expect us to have their backs. We welcome the debate, but there is no debate. This should be in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, where we can discuss these very weighty issues. We are looking

forward to that; we want that. But, no, this is a coin bill taken from the Senate and sent back over here with this put into it so we would have no debate. They don't want debate.

Our enemies are watching, and they are waiting. They are waiting for Iraq to become a free-fire zone, which is what it is going to become.

The last time, after the 4,500 untimely deaths of your American citizens, the executive decision was just to walk away—no ramp down, no policy, no strategy. Just walk away and leave the family members of those who had lost their loved ones wondering: What was that for?

You know what we have learned from that, Madam Speaker? Apparently nothing.

We want to do this, and we want to do this correctly, but this isn't the correct way to do it, and we should not abandon our servicemembers in combat.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a valued member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my good friend BARBARA LEE's longstanding amendment, which would repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force against Iraq.

More than 17 years ago, Congress passed a resolution authorizing the equivalent of war with Iraq, a war I opposed then. It stretches credulity to claim that same resolution now extends authorization to the President's order to assassinate a foreign leader from Iran. Yet, that is precisely what the White House would have you believe.

This AUMF is obsolete, and it is far past time that Congress make crystal clear to the administration, our allies, and our adversaries, as well as our constituents, the circumstances under which we would authorize engagement by our men and women in uniform.

The Lee amendment repeals a misguided AUMF that has had disastrous consequences, and it reasserts Congress' Article I authorities as provided and mandated by the Constitution of the United States.

Let's live up to our constitutional responsibility. Madam Speaker, let's support this amendment and get back to constitutional responsibilities and powers.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON), who was deployed to the Middle East four times during his 30-year career with the United States Air Force before his retirement as a brigadier general.

Mr. BACON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this amendment and to the disrespectful manner in which it was brought to the people's House.

It is strategically reckless and naive, and both amendments politicize our most serious constitutional obligation

and willfully bypass regular order just to score political points against our President.

Like many of my colleagues and my fellow veterans in the House, I agree it is long past due to update the two Authorizations for Use of Military Force now in effect. We owe our citizens and servicemembers an honest debate on the use of military force. Madam Speaker, 18 years is too long for this AUMF. We are not living up to our constitutional duties.

But let's be clear: This is not what this amendment does. Rather than confront reality that American security at home requires the principled use of force abroad, repealing the 2002 AUMF without a replacement will trigger our immediate withdrawal from Iraq.

Our military leaders have been clear. Without the 2002 AUMF or a suitable replacement, they cannot continue their missions in Iraq and defend themselves against Iranian-backed militias, the same militias that killed another American last month and attacked us again just 3 days ago.

Ask yourselves: Who benefits from this vote? It is Iran. Who loses from this vote? It is Iraq, the Kurds, and every U.S. partner in the Middle East. Our security will be compromised.

To our Democratic colleagues, you may think this is a free vote, that the Senate may not support or a veto will give you cover, but you would be wrong. A vote to repeal the 2002 AUMF without a replacement will embolden Iran and ISIS and sends an unmistakable message to every U.S. partner around the world that Congress has lost its resolve and that partisanship trumps America's national security and reason.

For the record, attaching these two provisions to a Congressional Gold Medal vote for the purpose of avoiding a motion to recommit is beneath the dignity of this Chamber and shameful by the majority, and it is disrespectful to the World War II veterans it recognizes.

Madam Speaker, I oppose this feckless amendment.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, let me say that no one on this side needs to be lectured to about preserving America's role in the world. I just think that we don't think there should be a blank check for war.

I will mention a couple of things that are relevant here. The 2001 AUMF passed after 9/11 authorizes counterterrorism operations. The 2002 AUMF has nothing to do with counterterrorism operations, al-Qaida, or ISIS. It specifically says the threat posed by Iraq, not al-Qaida. The reference to al-Qaida is in the findings, not in the authorization.

It does not need to be replaced because the 2001 AUMF is still in the books. The administration has been clear with Congress that counterterrorism operations would not stop if the 2002 AUMF is repealed.

I would note that it is the President's recent actions in the Middle East that

have posed challenges to our efforts to defeat ISIS. The United States has had to cease operations against ISIS because our military is needed for force protection after the Soleimani strike.

So if there is anything that has posed an obstacle to our fight against terrorism, it is the recent actions of the administration. I think a little thing should be put into perspective here.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT), a valued member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, for far too long, Congress has allowed the executive branch to usurp its constitutional responsibility of the power to go to war. Now, we have seen how a President can misuse one of his most solemn responsibilities as Commander in Chief.

The 2002 AUMF, which was built on a lie, on a lie of weapons of mass destruction, is long irrelevant and must be repealed.

The American people do not want war. The American people do not want war. Yet, the President has escalated the prospects of war in the Middle East in a way that has not only severely endangered U.S. interests and diplomacy to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon but has also resulted in the injury of at least 50 American servicemembers.

We must repeal the 2002 AUMF because the President has not been given the authority to go to war. And we must exercise the power of the purse and ensure that no funds are used for an unwanted, unauthorized war.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, also from Texas. He has made wonderful points.

For those of us who have studied history—especially in my case, spending my life studying history—you know one thing if you really understand history: Weakness is provocative.

There was no better display than in 1979, November 4, actually. I was at Fort Benning, in the Army there. We took notice when our Embassy was attacked, and we had a very weak President who went about begging Iran to let our people go without any threat. We just wanted diplomacy. Iran then and now does not understand the weakness they perceive from diplomacy unless there is a hammer behind it.

We are here today to vote on two amendments. One, of course, has already been discussed, titled “No War with Iran Act.” The other is titled “Repeal of Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002.”

Some of us have been wanting a new AUMF since we got here. During the Obama administration, it was clear we weren't going to get that. I appreciated Chairman McKeon allowing me to come up with language to try to make it a little better, but he made me stay

in a back room to write the language so the Democrats in the Senate didn't know it was me who was doing the language. That might have created a problem. We made some amendments, but we needed a new AUMF.

Where were my friends across the aisle when, out of no vital interest, as our own Secretary of Defense said on television, our President decided to attack Libya, the President of Libya who had blood on his hands from the 1980s and 1990s, but he had opened his doors and let us tell him what weapons they could have and not have? He was not a threat.

Look, we need a new AUMF, but the message that this will send to Iran is: Not only is this group trying to throw this President out and weaken him every which way they can, but now they are going to take away any power to kill somebody like Soleimani, which he just did.

If he was still alive, it appears clear there would be Americans dying.

Look, let's vote this down. Let's work together on a new AUMF that doesn't send word to our enemies that “President Trump is too weak to do anything,” because he is not. Quit sending that message.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER), a valued member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, one of our newer members.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of repealing the 2002 AUMF. The repeal of this authorization, which in 2002 authorized our use of military force in Saddam Hussein's Iraq, would have no effect—none—on current U.S. military operations.

To be clear, as a former CIA officer who worked counterterrorism issues, our own Nation's security is always my priority.

Today's vote is about that, our national security and the responsibility of Congress to exercise its constitutional authority over decisions of war and peace. It is not about one particular President, party, or administration. It is about Congress' constitutional responsibility, our duty to debate and vote on sending our Nation's servicemembers off to war.

But Congress has long evaded this duty, allowing President after President to use the 2001 AUMF—not this one, the one we are discussing today—to authorize varied military operations without Congress taking responsibility.

And after nearly two decades, the American people have waited to see principled leadership on ending the cycle of endless war. We must update the 2001 AUMF. But today's vote is on the now-defunct 2002 AUMF. Repealing this AUMF is a good first step towards Congress taking responsibility on behalf of the servicemembers we represent.

□ 1115

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from

California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Republican leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the House amendments to H.R. 550.

Before I explain why, I need to address what has become an all-too-frequent occurrence in this esteemed body, the abuse of power by the Democrat majority. We saw it during impeachment, and we are seeing it again now.

Today, Democrats are denying basic and essential floor rights to the Republicans as we consider these two flawed Iran measures. Specifically, by considering these measures as amendments to an unrelated, Gold Medal bill, the majority is intentionally using a partisan procedural gimmick to silence dissenting opinions. Even RO KHANNA recently admitted as much. He didn't want a vote on an amendment that could “divide the caucus.”

Leader HOYER did not respond to my letter that I recently sent him; the idea of eliminating a motion to recommit. We appealed to address these concerns and were rejected on the floor over and over again; 25 times, to be exact.

And no Republican amendments were ruled in order, including my amendment with Ranking Member COLE that would have allowed the President to use force if there was an imminent threat against the United States or our ally, Israel. Democrats were too afraid to debate that.

We can all agree that the decision to go to war is the most significant choice Congress can make, followed only by impeachment.

And we could also agree, as Leader HOYER recently said, that “more Members from across the ideological spectrum need to have input into the work we do” in the House.

These measures should be withdrawn until the Republicans' rights are fully restored. This tactic purposely eliminates Republicans' last opportunity to amend legislation, the motion to recommit.

Now, for 100 years, in this body, the motion to recommit has given the minority the right to—and let's quote—“have a vote upon its position upon great public questions.” That is the definition of a motion to recommit. “Have a vote upon its position upon great public questions.”

In other words, MTRs allow constituents whose Members are in the minority to have their voices heard. Certainly, I would think this issue before us would meet the standard of a great public question.

As referred to earlier, I sent that letter to Leader HOYER earlier this week, the procedural gimmick is not only wrong, it is in bad faith. The House has never debated matters of war and peace in such an irregular and restrictive manner.

What's more, Speaker PELOSI gave her word that her majority would not

govern like this. Just last May, she claimed to be “a big respecter” of minority rights.

You know what is so ironic about all of this? The use of this is very rare throughout the history of this entire body, a body we all respect.

What is most depressing is people talk a bigger game than they show in their actions.

Let me show you a little research on how often this tactic has ever been used. It wasn’t used ever on war, probably the most significant thing we would debate on this floor. But we are using a Gold Medal bill we already voted for, just for a gimmick.

In fact, in the 110th Congress, 16 times House bills with a Senate amendment were considered, and there was not one MTR given to the minority. If I have to refresh your memory, in the 110th Congress, Democrats were in the majority.

Compare that to in the Republican-led 109th Congress, which only debated one message, one time, under a rule like this. You know what the majority Republican-led Congress did then? They provided the minority with an amendment to compensate for the loss of a motion to recommit; something this majority has failed to do, again.

There is a difference between our two parties, and there is no bigger example than the tactic used today.

If Democrats will not withdraw these amendments, the House should vote them down immediately. This is a terrible time to be considering a repeal of the 2002 AUMF, a key authority to protect ourselves from the Iranian-backed militias in Iraq.

The Soleimani strike delivered a clear message to Iran: If you kill a U.S. citizen, you will suffer the consequences. For the first time in years, deterrence has been reestablished.

Yet, the threat of Iran and Iraq still remains and cannot be ignored. For the last 6 months, Iran has moved more and more military assets into Iraq. That is a fact.

And though deterrence has changed Iran’s calculus, it has not eliminated the timeless goals: One, to kick the United States out of the region by fraud or force; two, turn Iraq into a puppet state; and, three, take away the freedom of the Iraqi people, just as they stole the freedom from their own people.

Let’s not forget that Iran will seize every opportunity to undermine our interests in the region.

The Lee amendment would have us repeat the same strategic failures of the Obama administration, whose rush to withdraw from Iraq on a political timeline led to the direct rise of ISIS. If passed, it would send a message of weakness and division to the regime in Iran.

The RO KHANNA amendment is even more foolish and poorly-timed. The claim that it just prohibits an unauthorized war against Iran is totally false.

The Members on their phones should take a moment and actually realize what they are going to vote on because there are consequences to this judgment. They may make it easier, where they do not have to have an amendment where they actually have facts before their eyes and be judged upon a vote that is so serious as war.

Plainly, it abuses the power of the purse by proactively banning the use of force far short of war and makes exemptions only for direct attacks on U.S. territory or troops. Its effects are more constraining than the War Powers Resolution, which forces cutoffs in just 60 days.

Consider a few scenarios that would be illegal under RO KHANNA’s proposal. This is what you are voting for.

Think, for a moment, if Iran plans catastrophic attacks against New York and Jerusalem. The intelligence is clear and undeniable. Under KHANNA’s bill, we couldn’t use the military to protect ourselves or our allies. That is what you will vote for and have to answer to.

U.S. citizens are kidnapped, and our government knows the location and how to save them. Under KHANNA’s bill, we could not use our Navy SEALs or any other part of our military to rescue those Americans.

A U.S. merchant ship is in international waters and is being hijacked by the IRGC. Under the RO KHANNA bill, we couldn’t come to their rescue.

Any way you look at it, these amendments do not make Americans or our allies safer. But this is becoming a recurring, bad pattern for House Democrats.

It is interesting, the more I listen on the floor from the other side, Madam Speaker, I hear blame America first, instead of protect America first.

First, they had to be shamed by the Republicans into passing a resolution this week in support of the Iranian protesters. They rejected a Republican-led resolution just 2 weeks ago that would have given our total support.

Now, Democrats refuse to stand for our troops or our allies against our enemies.

Madam Speaker, the future of our policy in the Middle East will play a crucial role in determining the security of our citizens and the character of our Nation.

Iran is watching what we are doing today. Its regime is looking for signs of hesitation and disagreement, just like the denying of standing with those college students who would not walk on an American flag. But Congress would not say a word that week.

Its citizens—who are protesting in the streets for a free and accountable government—are looking for signs of assurance, poise, and support. They did not find that a few weeks ago. And today, they are going to hear a whole different message, once again.

But they aren’t the only ones watching. China and Russia are also closely studying our actions for signs. Our

long-term competition with China, in particular, directly involves Middle East energy resources which are still essential for our allies in the Pacific, even though, we, ourselves, are energy-independent.

Everyone is looking for signs about the future. Will it be a future we can be proud of or a future that we are going to be ashamed of?

Well, the future is never clear, but this much is: If we abandon our commitments now, we will be saying that we lack confidence in our values and resolve in our mission. The world will say, and history will record that we lost faith in the American cause in the moment that it was needed the most.

This is not the America I know and love. This is not the America you know and love. America is better than this. Americans are stronger than this.

I see an unbreakable spirit in my fellow Americans, and I know that, whatever the challenges ahead, together, we are up to the task; which is why I am ashamed of the actions of many of my colleagues today which divide us instead of uniting us.

If you truly believe in your position, debate it. If you truly believe in your position, stick with the 100-year tradition of allowing constituents to have a voice. You denied any ability to offer one amendment—one amendment.

You are so sure in your position that, yes, when the American is kidnapped, they won’t need the Navy SEAL to rescue them. You are so sure in your position that when we know the facts of the attack coming, you are so much smarter that you will tell Americans who die that we should not have stopped it.

You are so sure in your position that you would change a century of history just so you wouldn’t have to debate.

Madam Speaker, that is not what the Founders devised this floor to be about; that the sheer, raw power of a majority would be used in a manner to deny a voice because they could not win a vote; because they wanted to drive a policy that made us weaker.

Madam Speaker, the idea that we would blame America first, instead of stand with it, is not one I could support.

Madam Speaker, it has been very clear from the administration, from the intel community, from our men and women in service, this is not what they expect of us.

If you are proud enough, and you believe your policy brings people more freedom, why would you change 100 years of precedent? Why would you change, just to be able to think you can win in a corrupt manner?

Madam Speaker, I hope all those examples I showed never come to fruition, because we could not look at Americans in the eye and say we had an honest debate; it was played by the rules; and everybody had an opportunity to make sure it was the best resolution passed.

No. History will say there was a Gold Medal bill that everybody voted for,

then we gutted it and amended it, so we denied people a voice. Because of sheer, raw power of being in the majority, we were willing to break a 100-year tradition.

It doesn't matter what the language said or how open it would be. It doesn't matter that we were afraid to be challenged that our bill is wrong. We think we are so right that we will do anything to make America weaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

□ 1130

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of both the repeal of the Authorization for Use of Military Force against Iraq in 2002 and the No War Against Iran Act, and I thank Congressman RO KHANNA and Congresswoman BARBARA LEE for their true leadership.

Sending our servicemembers into war is one of Congress' most solemn constitutional responsibilities. History will show this administration's reckless go-it-alone strategy against Iran with no allied support has left America less safe.

Indeed, having dodged the draft himself, the President does not appreciate the true costs of war. Just look at the President's initial report that no U.S. troops were harmed following Iran's retaliatory strike on U.S. bases in Iraq. It has since been reported that at least 50 U.S. servicemembers were wounded and suffered traumatic brain injuries, a stark contrast from President Trump's tweet on January 8 stating all is well.

The cavalier approach this President has taken in escalatory action against Iran is haphazard. Our servicemembers' safety and America's security have been hard won.

This Congress fully understands the cost of liberty. It is why, today, we reassert our Article I power and clearly demand a clear request if the administration wishes to engage in war with Iran.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, this Congress will ensure the wise, strategic, and prudent use of force to win the future by defending the American people and not carelessly tripping into war with Iran.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO), a Marine combat veteran of the Gulf war and a current member of the Mississippi National Guard.

Mr. PALAZZO. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend, Mr. MCCAUL, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the amendment before us today is another example of the Democrats' most recent campaign to undermine our military, our national security, and, as always, President Trump.

Repealing the AUMF of 2002 without a replacement is dangerous, and the House majority must understand that. If the Democrats choose to adopt this amendment, it shows our military men and women stationed in the Middle East that the United States Congress does not have their backs.

By adopting this amendment, it tells our enemies that they can continue attacking the United States completely unchecked. It projects uncertainty and weakness to those who are actively working against us.

The United States must maintain the ability to counter terrorist attacks, and an active AUMF accomplishes that. This amendment, if adopted, will only weaken America's defense strategy in the Middle East.

The AUMF is important and helped lead our military to the defeat of al-Qaida in Iraq. It continues helping us identify other international terrorist organizations that want to harm Americans and spread terror throughout the world.

No one wants endless wars in the Middle East, but we must have the tools necessary to react in this highly volatile region. We should not prevent the President from defending Americans from imminent threats. To do this is reckless and dangerous. Not only will it put our military at risk, but it will also endanger American civilians.

Keep in mind, we need to fight the global war on terrorism over there; otherwise, it will end up in our backyards. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this dangerous resolution.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, let me just say I would like to briefly respond to the Republican leader's remarks about the Iranian protest movement, because I feel very strongly about the Iranian protest movement and in supporting them.

The leader accused the Democrats of being shamed into passing the resolution in support of the protestors in Iran. I want to correct the record because Mr. DEUTCH, who is a Democrat, introduced this resolution nearly a month before Mr. MCCARTHY; the House Foreign Affairs Committee marked the resolution a couple of weeks later.

So there was no shame, except accusing Democrats of any nefarious motives. That is shameful.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), the chairwoman of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of the Lee amendment to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force against Iraq.

In 2002, this Chamber voted to invade Iraq on what would later prove to be false and misleading intelligence provided by the Bush administration. We removed Saddam Hussein, established a democratic government in Iraq, and declared a formal end to the mission in 2011.

However, that 18-year-old authorization is now being used by the President to escalate a conflict with Iran, a conflict that the American people strongly oppose and one that Congress never authorized.

The Constitution states plainly that Congress shall have the power to declare war and peace. This amendment exercises that constitutional authority, reflects the will of the American people, and is the first step to finally ending our endless wars and bringing them to an end.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the Lee amendment.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the Republican whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on our ability to make sure that any administration, Republican or Democrat, has the ability for the President to carry out their duties as Commander in Chief. And that is what is at stake here, this amendment that we are debating right now that would completely repeal the 2002 AUMF and not have an honest conversation, a sincere debate about if there should be any changes to it, modernize, work with the administration. Again, any Commander in Chief should have the ability to defend America, to respond to attacks on Americans both here in America or abroad.

Madam Speaker, as you look at this debate as well as the vote we are going to be taking shortly on the Iranian language, which would limit the ability of the President to respond to attacks coming from Iran, it is another major concern about whether or not we are going to have a Commander in Chief who can actually defend America.

There are things that are going on right now that we all know are an underlying part of this debate. Let's start with the taking out of one of the bloodiest terrorists in the history of this country, Soleimani, who was just taken out primarily using the authority of the 2002 AUMF, which would be gutted if this were to pass.

So I don't think most people in this country think it is a debatable question of a bloody terrorist who killed hundreds of American troops. This guy had the blood of over 600 U.S. servicemen and -women on his hands. He was in Iraq plotting to take out more Americans, to kill more Americans, and he was taken out.

Is it really a question of whether or not that was the right thing to do? I think most Americans would agree he was a brutal terrorist. And whether it was Osama bin Laden or al-Baghdadi or

other terrorists who want to kill Americans, our Commander in Chief ought to have the ability to protect Americans and stop terrorists who want to kill more Americans. To take away that ability is reckless. It is destructive to the country.

Again, if you wanted to have an honest debate, Madam Speaker, you would have seen the committees of jurisdiction have true hearings on this, bring in people in the administration, talk about what the right way to approach this is.

That is not what happened. They literally took a coin bill—a coin bill—and brought it forward with these two amendments so that there can't be that honest debate on both sides, shutting out the minority's ability to bring amendments, to have an honest discussion about what the process should be.

In terms of Iran, just think about what they are doing there. It is not only Iran. It is Iranian proxies that carry out attacks against servicemembers of the United States and our allies, and they take that away, too.

Don't tie the hands of any President of the United States, Republican or Democrat, from being able to defend this country both here and abroad. I oppose both amendments and would hope we reject it.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, let me quickly say that I agree with Mr. SCALISE that the Foreign Affairs Committee should be having hearings on this. We have tried to get the Secretary of State to come. I am still hopeful he is coming, but it is a little hard to hold hearings if you don't get the administration witness to come to the hearings. We are trying.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today in support of my good friend and colleague's commonsense measure, and I want to thank Representative LEE for her leadership and her moral courage.

I also would just say we have heard a lot with respect to objections around the process. Long before I got here, Representative LEE, as I understand it, secured a similar amendment in an appropriations bill just a few years ago. In the dead of night, the prior Speaker of the House struck that amendment out of the bill, and I didn't hear many process objections at that time from so many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. If folks want to have an honest debate, let's have that honest debate.

For my part, I support this measure and what it represents. I believe it is ultimately about the need to underscore to this administration the constitutional limitations placed on its authority, a reminder that is necessary because of this President's reckless foreign policy and his refusal to engage Congress in the authorities placed with us by the Founders.

This Chamber is often referred to as the "people's House," elected by the

people, charged to represent the people and to govern for the people. The Founders, the Framers, in their infinite wisdom, decided to rest the solemn power to declare war with the Congress as the people's House, and yet, for the better part of the last 18 years, this Chamber has abdicated its traditional role.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Colorado an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. NEGUSE. Administration after administration has used this authority to engage our Armed Forces in various conflicts around the world.

It is time for Congress to return to its traditional role under our constitutional structure. I support this measure. I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My service in the House has been marked by a loss of Congress' power to deal with war and peace. I am proud to stand with my friend, Congresswoman LEE, as I did with her in her 2002 amendment. Republicans empowered President Bush for the worst foreign policy blunder in our history, and we are still paying the price for the war in Iraq.

It is time to end this bipartisan failure, time to end it, stand up for Congress. This is especially critical today with the reckless current occupant who cozies up to dictators like Putin and some of the worst people on the planet, and who attacks our allies with trade wars. He committed colossal blunders like breaking the Iranian nuclear agreement, which the Iranians had abided by, and by killing the second most powerful person in Iran, which made us less safe.

It is time to vote for the Lee amendment, repeal the AUMF, a key tool to rein in a reckless President and reclaim the rightful powers of Congress over war and peace.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I stand in strong support of Representative LEE's resolution to repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force against Iraq.

The Constitution is unambiguous; it is clear: Congress has the power to authorize war.

In 2002, Congress passed an Authorization for Use of Military Force to address the ongoing threat from Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq to this country.

With the overthrow of Saddam Hussein by U.S. military forces and the establishment of a new Iraqi Government, this AUMF became obsolete; but we continued, Democratic Presidents

and Republican Presidents, to use the Authorization for Use of Military Force ongoing, as if the same conditions existed then.

If there is a need for the authorization for the use of military force against any threat, we should bring it up and have a full and fair and open debate on what that threat is constituted of and, as a Congress, exercise that constitutional authority to declare war.

This language does not prevent a President from defending America. Don't let anyone tell you that.

It is important that we exercise our constitutional role.

□ 1145

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I rise to support Representative LEE's amendment to say no to unauthorized wars.

The Trump administration claims that this outdated authorization justifies future strikes against Iran. That is outrageous. And as a result of the assassination of General Soleimani and Iran's retaliation, we now have 50 American soldiers tragically injured.

Representative LEE, during debate in 2002 on this very authorization, said: "It does not take leadership to go drop bombs and go to war. It takes real leadership to negotiate and to develop peaceful resolutions to our security needs."

Seventeen years ago, Madam Speaker, I spoke at a rally of 50,000 people in Seattle who believed the evidence was not there to go to war in Iraq. Today, we know we were right. We must learn from that.

Let's repeal this outdated authorization and ensure that Congress has real oversight and debate before we go into any war. Let's show leadership and stop these endless, unauthorized wars.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. Madam Speaker, today, I rise in strong support of Representative BARBARA LEE's amendment to repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force in Iraq.

We cannot allow this President or any President to use an outdated AUMF intended to address Saddam Hussein to wage unauthorized wars against whatever leader they are upset with on any given day.

Because of congressional inaction, the U.S. military is operating in at

least 76 countries across the world, and we have spent trillions of dollars on military activities since 9/11, largely on unauthorized wars abroad, when we could be helping people at home, expanding Social Security, ensuring healthcare is a human right, and investing in green jobs and renewable energy.

Recently, the President threatened this bill with a veto. It only made the case more clear: Congress must reassert its constitutional authority per Article I, Section 8, to declare war.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support both Representative RO KHANNA's bill to prohibit funding for war with Iran and Representative LEE's efforts to repeal the 2002 AUMF.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Speaker, I was deployed to Iraq in 2004 and served with the most patriotic Americans and committed Iraqi partners in Baghdad, Fallujah, Kirkuk, and Mosul.

While the justification for that war was fundamentally flawed, our authorized mission was to defend the national security of the United States from the continuing threat posed by the Government of Iraq.

Yes, we continue to counter ISIS in Iraq, but the Government of Iraq no longer poses a threat to our national security, and that is why I advocate for the repeal of the 2002 AUMF.

We have a responsibility to the men and women who wear the uniform to ensure that the authorized missions they execute are targeted, defined, and achievable. We cannot accomplish that goal with a nearly two-decade-old authorization that doesn't recognize the current landscape.

With this amendment, we officially end America's 2002 mission in Iraq.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, this administration's rogue attempt to start a war with Iran endangers countless lives around the world and was a wake-up call for Congress that we must reclaim our constitutional role as a check on executive power to wage endless wars.

Repealing the AUMF of 2002 is an important step toward reasserting that Congress alone has the authority to declare war. The 2002 AUMF was passed to wage a war ultimately deemed to be based on lies, and the United States military operations pursuant to the 2002 AUMF ended in 2011.

Iraq is a sovereign nation, and passing today's amendment is an important measure of respect for our key ally.

The 2002 AUMF is an outdated relic whose only function is to provide this administration with cover to claim that Congress has authorized attacks

on Iran or whichever country draws its attention. Leaving it in place makes us less safe in our country.

Madam Speaker, I thank Representative LEE, my mentor, for her leadership on repealing the 2002 AUMF and ending our forever wars so that we can better serve our constituents at home.

Madam Speaker, I know Ms. LEE was alone at one point. She is not alone anymore. We stand with her in pushing back against this very much unconstitutional measure by the President of the United States.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ), our Republican colleague.

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, I come to vote my heart.

Saddam died more than a decade ago, and even the faintest echoes of his regime have long dissolved.

So if we are unable to declare victory and bring our troops home at this time after Saddam is dead, after his regime has evaporated, after ISIS has collapsed, then no war is ever truly winnable and every authorization is an authorization for a forever war.

Let's not hand the 21st century off to China as we toil in the Middle East. Instead of sending America's bravest patriots to the bloodstained sands of the Middle East, let's care for our veterans here at home.

Instead of wasting American treasure bombing and rebuilding Iraq, let's rebuild our own great Nation. Let's secure the U.S. border with Mexico before we send the next soldier, sailor, dollar, or marine to secure Iraq's border with Iran.

Instead of ill-fated adventurism, let's put America first.

Keeping U.S. Forces in Iraq is not what President Trump wants. It is not what the American people want. It is not what the Iraq parliament wants.

The best time to vote against the Iraq war would have been in 2002. The second best time is today.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, my first opportunity in speaking today is to make sure that we honor all the men and women who are wearing uniforms in the United States military, as Congresswoman LEE has said, her family members and many family members who served.

What we do know is we found no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

We supported Congresswoman LEE in the rational position to have the inspection go forth, to know what was going on. The only thing we secured was an endless war.

In the question of Iran, Mr. RO KHANNA's position is right. If there is any need to defend us in Iran, the War Powers Resolution allows a President

to do that if we are defending ourselves against attacks or if there are hostilities.

We need to address this in a constitutional way. Article I says that Congress declares war.

The endless war that has carried on, for those of us who have been to Iraq and then Afghanistan realize that our soldiers deserve the dignity of a debate when they should go to war.

Let me say to those who were injured by Iran: It is not just a side hit, if you will. These soldiers have been hit. We honor them.

We should have a Congress to stand up if we go to war, not use this resolution. It should be repealed.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is not a resolution to go to war. My friend, the minority leader, wrote me a letter and implied that it was.

These two bills are about the Constitution and about the awesome responsibility placed upon the Congress of the United States to determine whether or not we do go to war. It is not in Article II. It is in Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

With Democrats as President of the United States and Republicans as President of the United States, this Congress has too often ceded its constitutional responsibility to the President of the United States.

The Founders would find that very dangerous. They wanted a cumulative voice of the American people to make this extraordinary decision to go to war.

It has been said that the Congresswoman from California, BARBARA LEE, stood as a lone and courageous voice in voting "no" when America was attacked, not because she did not want to defend America, but because she wanted to ensure that we did so in a thoughtful way and in a correct way.

It has been said before that nothing in this resolution prevents America or members of our Armed Forces from defending themselves.

This vote is about the Constitution of the United States. Both votes are about the Constitution of the United States.

Americans have experienced a generation of war abroad to prevent terror at home.

Madam Speaker, I was preceded by just a little bit by Mr. GAETZ from Florida. He and I don't agree on much. We have different perspectives on policy. But he and I agree on these two bills.

In Afghanistan and Iraq, our troops have fought courageously. Their families have sacrificed. Their friends and neighbors have waited anxiously for news of their safe return home. Many, tragically, did not return. We hold

them in our hearts today as we engage in this critical debate about the nature of Congress' role in making consequential decisions of war and peace.

The Founders wanted those of us, particularly in this House, to every 2 years have to go back to our constituents to renew our contract to represent them. The Founders did that because they wanted us to be in close touch with the American people, and they wanted the people's views reflected before any one person took us to war.

Now, the House has already voted on both of these propositions, on Ms. LEE's bill and on Mr. KHANNA's bill. Now, they have presented us with two amendments.

Last year, during the debate on the National Defense Authorization Act, they were included and passed by this House.

□ 1200

These are not new propositions. They were approved with bipartisan support. I don't mean one Republican or two Republicans, or three Republicans—as my Republican colleagues talk about, well, the impeachment opposition was bipartisan with one or two; one of whom, of course, is now a Republican.

But the vote was 27 in one vote and 14 in the other. Fourteen Republicans voted for Congresswoman LEE's proposition, and they did so largely on the basis of what Mr. GAETZ from Florida had to say.

In Representative KHANNA's amendment, the tally was 251–170. Fourteen Republicans voted for Ms. LEE's amendment and 27 for Mr. KHANNA's amendment.

Now, Mr. KHANNA's resolution is directly related to the Constitution and Ms. LEE's is directly related to what Mr. GAETZ said. Whether you agreed or not with what is happening in Iraq, it is over. The bipartisan votes are a testament to the very strong public sentiment that sending America's young men and women to war must not be the decision of the Commander in Chief. And from my perspective, frankly, certainly not this Commander in Chief who is so impulsive and so inclined to avoid and deny the advice of his Secretary of Defense and other intelligence-related personnel.

That is why, as I said earlier, our Founders enshrined in the Constitution that only Congress can declare war. That is why we have the War Powers Act that we adopted in 1973. That is why we are having this debate on the floor today.

I strongly support both the Lee amendment and the Khanna amendment. The former would repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force in Iraq which was meant to enable, as Mr. GAETZ so powerfully said, the removal of Saddam Hussein. He is gone. We are not at war with Iraq.

Sadly, that resolution is being used some 18 years later as rationale for doing something not against Iraq, not against Saddam Hussein—who we all

know is dead—but for something else. The something else needs to be approved by this Congress unless it is a defensive action, again, which is provided for.

The latter would prohibit the Trump administration from using Federal funds without congressional authorization to strike Iran in the absence of an imminent threat. “In the absence of an imminent threat” is the key language.

This is not about retreat. This is not about exposing us to danger. It is carrying out the strictures of the Constitution of the United States. Let me make this point clear: Nowhere in this bill do we take funding away from the military or say that our forces cannot defend themselves. We include clear language to ensure that if an imminent threat presents itself, our forces can strike and respond to that threat.

I am proud that so many Democratic Members of the House are veterans who know what it means to serve at the point of the spear. Mr. BROWN, my colleague from Maryland, just spoke. He was one of those. Many of our freshmen served in the military during the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts and are working hard to make sure that our Democratic House majority always keeps faith with those in uniform and our veterans.

They have been instrumental in helping to shape our policies in a way that is smart, strategic and strengthens our national security.

Let me also say that Iran remains a dangerous enemy. I doubt that there is a person on this floor who disagrees with that. No one is suggesting taking our eye off Iran and its malevolent behavior, and no one is mourning the loss of Soleimani. That is not the issue.

The issue is, as I said at the beginning, the Constitution. That is why Congress needs to take action now to make it clear that the President does not have the unilateral authority to take America into another costly war in the Middle East or anywhere else.

We passed the War Powers Resolution on a bipartisan basis earlier this month. This is not a partisan issue. This is an issue of standing up for the Article I branch of government, the Congress of the United States, who represent the people. We call this the people's House, and the Founders wanted the people to make this decision.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank Representative LEE and Representative KHANNA, as well as all of those who have been involved in this effort, for bringing these two propositions to the floor of the House.

I urge each and every one of my colleagues to vote for these bills. I also hope that those who voted with the Khanna amendment, 27 Republicans, stick with their principles; stick with their commitment to the Constitution; stick with the separation of powers; stick with the awesome responsibility of this House, representing the people, to be the ones that make that terribly hard decision to send our people to war.

I hope that the 14 who voted for the Lee amendment stick with their principles to rationally say: Iraq is over. It is gone. The resolution of authorization is 18 years old. It is time for us to look anew, think anew, and act anew as the circumstances require.

I thank Ms. LEE and Mr. KHANNA. Let us pass these two amendments. That is what our Founders would want us to do.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I rise today in response to my good friend from Maryland who just spoke. As one of those 27 who voted with the Democrats on that previous resolution, I stand in opposition today because this is a sham.

You are using a commemorative coin bill on the floor of the House so we cannot debate the merits of this constitutional question. That is a shame. And just on that basis alone, I vote “no.”

You are damn right we should, as Members of Congress, exercise our constitutional authority, and we need to come back to this question and debate honestly and openly. When we put our men and women in harm's way, we should set aside our Democrat and Republican colors and say: Let's stand as Americans.

So if you want to use this sham process to shame me, I will accept that because I will do the right thing each and every day.

Vote “no” on these amendments. Vote “no” on this sham, and let's have a real debate as Members of Congress do in our constitutional responsibility.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The Chair reminds Members to address their remarks to the Chair and to maintain the appropriate decorum on the floor.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, there is no sham here. We have debated this proposition. This is the second time we have debated it, and it has passed twice. There is no sham here.

I will talk about the MTR sham that you are arguing about at a later time. But this is on the merits of whether or not you believe the Congress of the United States ought to be making these decisions. Don't hide behind some sham argument about MTRs. We will get to that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds all Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I think back to my dad's war. Churchill warned Neville Chamberlain about the dark clouds of the Nazi regime on the horizon. He talked about how weakness invites aggression, and then we saw Hitler take the world stage.

Reagan talked about peace through strength. These are the ideals I believe

in, and these bills do not project that. They project weakness; weakness with ISIS; weakness with Iran; and weakness with our enemies.

I would like to close by stating the obvious, and I think we all can agree here to some extent, that the 2002 AUMF is outdated. It is almost 20 years old. I believe it is time to replace it with a new authority that is tailored to the specific threats that we face today.

But one thing that has been mischaracterized is that this only applied to Saddam Hussein, when, in fact, the AUMF says: "Iraq poses a continuing threat to the national security of the United States." And Iraq does, among other things, "harbor other international terrorist organizations, including organizations that threaten the lives and safety of American citizens."

That, my friend, is ISIS. It is not just Saddam Hussein. It is ISIS. And we have seen ISIS too much. We owe an updated AUMF to our soldiers, I think, who are in Iraq risking their lives for our security. We owe a debt to our partners and to the American people. But the problem, Madam Speaker, and the reason I oppose this amendment, is because passing it, does not make any progress toward that goal.

A standalone repeal does not recognize the reality on the ground that our counterterrorism mission in Iraq is ongoing as we debate here on the floor right now, today.

The inspector general for the counter-ISIS mission just reported last quarter that: "In Iraq . . . ISIS continued this quarter to solidify and expand its command and control structures." On the other hand, they said: ". . . it had not increased its capabilities in areas where the coalition was actively conducting operations against ISIS."

Madam Speaker, repealing the AUMF without a replacement shows our soldiers, our partners, our adversaries, that we are undermining our important mission there to protect the homeland; that we are not committed to completing the mission; and that we are not committed to a free and democratic Iraq.

The last time the United States abandoned Iraq under President Obama, ISIS reared its ugly head and formed the caliphate.

Just a few short years later, they declared it a caliphate and killed and savaged thousands of people. We all saw the videos. It surged all across the world. At that time, I was chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, and in 2016, the threat briefings were absolutely terrifying; one external operation after another to kill Americans in the United States out of Iraq and Syria.

None of us want to see the next ISIS rise. None of us in this Chamber should allow that to ever happen again. So let's have a serious conversation about what an Authorization for Use of Military Force to defeat today's threats

would look like instead of playing partisan politics.

□ 1215

What else are the Democrats' partisan maneuvers costing us today? They are exploiting the Greatest Generation, our World War II merchant mariners whose brothers died at the hands of the Nazis on the high seas.

World War II veterans are dying every day, yet this majority is hijacking a bipartisan bill to honor their bravery in World War II as the vehicle for these two political measures.

Rather than sending the President a Senate-passed version of this bill to grant this long-overdue recognition, they are setting that effort back to square one where it will require passage again by the Senate that is tied up with impeachment.

Let me just say this: As the son of a World War II veteran, I am saddened and ashamed that the majority would allow playing procedural games that set back this bipartisan bill that was on its way to the President's desk. They are forcing these elderly merchant mariners, World War II veterans, to wait even longer for the thanks of a grateful nation.

In closing, we owe it to our constituents to take action to replace this 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force, but this, Madam Speaker, does nothing to meet that goal.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this empty and reckless gesture and vote "no" on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of closing.

Madam Speaker, in 2002, the House authorized the Bush administration to go to war the Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq. It makes no sense that this authorization is still on the books when the original purpose of it has long passed.

It is dangerous when we see an administration trying to claim that this decades-old vote gives them a green light to conduct military actions against Iran.

With this measure today, there is no blank check for war. The President must come to the Congress.

We want to fill our constitutional role. Only Congress can declare war, not the President. With this measure today, we can finally reclaim Congress' constitutional role in war powers and repeal this outdated authorization that has been misused time and time and time again.

As my friend from Texas knows, the 2001 9/11 AUMF is cited as the authority for every operation against terrorists in Iraq. This AUMF needs to be updated and limited. The 2002 Iraq war AUMF does not need to be updated; it just needs to be repealed.

What we are saying here is that there should be no automatic blank check for war. If this President or future Presi-

dents want to go to war, they must come to Congress. Only Congress can declare war.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this, no blank check for war. If war is necessary, it will happen, but it shouldn't be a blank check for Presidents to go to war. We want peace; we don't want war; and now is the time to show it.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Amendments to the Senate Amendment to H.R. 550, to repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq, and to prohibit the use of force in or against Iran without Congressional authorization. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting these two bills which would begin to reclaim Congress's Constitutional authority over the use of force.

First, the repeal of the 2002 AUMF is long overdue. Passed in the lead up to the Iraq War, the objectives embodied in the authorization are obsolete. Leaving it in effect only invites abuse by this or any other administration, undermining Congress's Article I authority. This 18-year-old authorization should not remain as a blank check for the United States to engage in military action in Iraq in perpetuity. By passing this repeal, Congress will reclaim the important decision-making authority the Founders specifically afforded to the legislature, and not the executive branch.

I also strongly support the No War Against Iran Act. The Administration's reckless policies towards Iran have repeatedly brought us near the brink of a war with Iran, one which would be contrary to our interests, which the American people do not want, and which the Congress has never authorized. This bill would make clear that the President does not have the unilateral authority to drag us into war, while leaving in place authorities needed to counter Iran's malicious influence in the region.

Finally, while not the subject of the vote today, I hope that the renewed Congressional interest in reclaiming our war powers authorities will be followed by an effort to sunset the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force against those who planned and conducted the 9/11 attacks. This authorization has been stretched beyond recognition to authorize force against terrorist groups around the world, many of which didn't exist in 2001. Should the Executive Branch need additional authorities beyond those granted in Article II, they should come to Congress and make the case for what those authorities should be so that we can determine if a replacement authorization is needed. But the Congressional inertia that has kept the 2001 AUMF in place has gone on too long, and I hope that we will see renewed bipartisan energy to replace it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee and a cosponsor, I rise in strong support of RCP 116-49, the House Amendment to the Senate Amendment to H.R. 550, the No War With Iran Act, introduced by the gentlewoman from California, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE.

I thank my Out of Iraq colleague, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, for sponsoring this legislation which repeals P.L. 107-43, the broad,

unrestrained, and outdated 2002 Authorization for the Use of Military Force (AUMF) against Iraq, which was passed and signed into law on October 16, 2002, nearly twenty years ago.

Congress never intended for the 2002 AUMF to have such broad and extended reach.

Over the last 18 years, we have seen 3 Presidents use this legislation as a blank check to engage in serious military action.

The 2002 AUMF is an outdated piece of legislation and repealing it will not affect any current military operations.

The 2002 AUMF's only function is to provide the President with cover to claim Congress has already authorized him to attack Iranian officials, which is false.

Moreover, the 2002 AUMF is unnecessary because in the administration's own view, everything the 2002 AUMF covers is already fully covered under the 2001 9/11 AUMF, except for attacks against Iran.

Congress passed the 2002 AUMF to address the perceived threat posed by the regime of Saddam Hussein and the AUMF permitted the President to use the Armed Forces as "necessary and appropriate" to "defend U.S. national security against the continuing threat posed by Iraq" and to "enforce all relevant Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq."

U.S. military deployments and operations carried out pursuant to the 2002 AUMF—dubbed Operation Iraqi Freedom—officially concluded in 2011.

Almost 18 years after the resolution's passage, the United States recognizes the sovereignty of Iraq and considers Iraq a key ally.

Under the Constitution, Congress has the sole duty to declare war. Repealing obsolete Authorizations for Use of Military Force (AUMFs) is essential to Congress living up to its constitutional responsibilities.

Leaving the 2002 AUMF in place increases the likelihood that future Presidents will use it as a basis to start a new war, or expand a current one, without Congress's explicit authorization.

In July 2019, the House adopted a Lee amendment to NDAA virtually identical to H.R. 2456, To Repeal the AUMF Against Iraq Resolution of 2002, by a bipartisan vote of 242 to 180. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership stripped it out.

The overly broad 2002 AUMF represents a critical deterioration of congressional oversight.

As our brave servicemembers are deployed around the world in combat zones, Congress is missing in action.

Congress must repeal the 2002 AUMF immediately to fulfill its constitutional obligation to provide oversight and consent on matters of war and peace.

As provided under the War Powers Resolution of 1973, absent a congressional declaration of war or authorization for the use of military force, the President as Commander-in-Chief has constitutional power to engage the U.S. Armed Forces in hostilities only in the case of a national emergency created by an attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its Armed Forces.

Madam Speaker, since the objectives which led Congress to pass the 2002 Authorization to Use Military Force (AUMF) have been achieved, I believe the authorization to use that military force expired automatically.

Madam Speaker, where a congressional authorization to use military force has expired, the President must obtain a new authorization to continue the use of force.

Given the material changes in circumstances, introducing additional U.S. combat troops into the region would be both unwise and beyond the scope of authority conferred by the 2002 AUMF.

As a co-equal branch of government, it is Congress's right and responsibility to be fully consulted regarding any potential plans to expand military operations in the region, to assess whether such action is in the national security interest of the United States and our allies, and to withhold or grant authorization for the use of military force based on this assessment.

As we have learned from the painful and bitter experience of the past 18 years, at the initiation of hostilities, the costs in terms of blood and treasure of U.S. military interventions abroad are often underestimated and the benefits overstated.

More than 6,800 American servicemembers gave the last full measure of devotion to their country on battlefields in Afghanistan and Iraq, with hundreds of thousands more returning with physical, emotional, or psychological wounds that may never heal.

The direct economic cost of the war in the Persian Gulf exceeds \$1.07 trillion, including \$773 billion in Overseas Contingency Operations funds, an increase of \$243 billion to the Department of Defense base budget, and an increase of \$54.2 billion to the Veterans Administration budget to address the human costs of the military involvement in Iraq.

We should not repeat the mistakes of the past and my position on this issue is directly aligned with the will of the American people.

I commend my colleague, Representative BARBARA LEE, for her introduction and advocacy of this legislation that will repeal the outdated 2002 AUMF.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I am a proud cosponsor of both of these bills on the floor today—H.R. 2456 to repeal the 2002 AUMF and H.R. 5543, No War Against Iran to prevent any funds from being used for military force against Iran. Having previously voted in support of these bills as amendments to the Fiscal Year 2020 National Defense Authorization Act, I believe bringing these bills to the floor today is important in order to reassert Congress' constitutional authority. The 2002 AUMF is an outdated piece of legislation. U.S. military deployments and operations carried out pursuant to the 2002 AUMF—dubbed Operation Iraqi Freedom—officially concluded in 2011. Almost 18 years after the resolution's passage, the United States recognizes the sovereignty of Iraq and considers Iraq a key ally. Under the constitution, Congress has the sole authority to declare war. Repealing obsolete AUMFs is essential to Congress living up to its constitutional responsibilities. Leaving the 2002 AUMF in place increases the likelihood that future Presidents will use it as a basis to start a new war, or expand a current one, without Congress's explicit authorization. Following our January 9 vote on, H. Con. Res. 83, a War Powers Resolution to make clear the President could not constitutionally escalate the conflict with Iran without congressional approval, the Trump Administration has only continued to thumb its nose at the Constitution

and has ignored Congress' authority as a co-equal branch of government. I, again, urge the Trump Administration to refocus its efforts on creating a coherent and constructive strategy towards the Middle East.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 811, the previous question is ordered on this portion of the divided question.

The question is: Will the House concur in the Senate amendment with the House amendment specified in section 4(b) of House Resolution 811?

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Concurring in the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 with the amendment specified in section 4(a) of House Resolution 811; and

Concurring in the Senate amendment to H.R. 550 with the amendment specified in section 4(b) of House Resolution 811.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

MERCHANT MARINERS OF WORLD WAR II CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on concurring in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 550) to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Merchant Mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II, with the House amendment specified in section 4(a) of House Resolution 811, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 175, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—228

Adams	Beatty	Brindisi
Aguilar	Bera	Brown (MD)
Allred	Beyer	Brownley (CA)
Amash	Bishop (GA)	Bustos
Axne	Blumenauer	Butterfield
Barragán	Blunt Rochester	Carbajal
Bass	Bonamici	Cárdenas

Carson (IN)	Hollingsworth	Perlmutter	Hurd (TX)	Mooney (WV)	Stauber	Cárdenas	Himes	Perlmutter
Cartwright	Horn, Kendra S.	Peters	Johnson (LA)	Newhouse	Stefanik	Carson (IN)	Horn, Kendra S.	Peters
Case	Horsford	Peterson	Johnson (OH)	Norman	Steil	Cartwright	Horsford	Peterson
Casten (IL)	Houlihan	Phillips	Johnson (SD)	Nunes	Steube	Case	Houlihan	Phillips
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	Pingree	Jordan	Palazzo	Stewart	Casten (IL)	Hoyer	Pingree
Castro (TX)	Huffman	Pocan	Joyce (OH)	Palmer	Taylor	Castor (FL)	Huffman	Pocan
Chu, Judy	Jackson Lee	Porter	Joyce (PA)	Pence	Thompson (PA)	Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Porter
Cicilline	Jayapal	Pressley	Katko	Perry	Thornberry	Chu, Judy	Jayapal	Pressley
Cisneros	Jeffries	Price (NC)	Keller	Posey	Timmons	Cicilline	Jeffries	Price (NC)
Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Quigley	Kelly (PA)	Ratcliffe	Tipton	Cisneros	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (TX)	Raskin	King (NY)	Reed	Turner	Clark (MA)	Johnson (TX)	Raskin
Clay	Kaptur	Rice (NY)	Kustoff (TN)	Reschenthaler	Upton	Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Rice (NY)
Cleaver	Keating	Richmond	LaHood	Rice (SC)	Van Drew	Clay	Keating	Richmond
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Rose (NY)	LaMalfa	Riggleman	Wagner	Cleaver	Kelly (IL)	Rose (NY)
Cohen	Kennedy	Rouda	Lamb	Roby	Walorski	Cloud	Kennedy	Rouda
Connolly	Khanna	Roybal-Allard	Lamborn	Rodgers (WA)	Walden	Clyburn	Khanna	Roy
Cooper	Kildee	Ruiz	Latta	Rogers (KY)	Waltz	Cohen	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Correa	Kilmer	Ruppersberger	Lesko	Rose, John W.	Watkins	Connolly	Kilmer	Ruiz
Costa	Kim	Rush	Long	Rouzer	Weber (TX)	Correa	Kim	Ruppersberger
Courtney	Kind	Ryan	Lucas	Roy	Webster (FL)	Costa	Kind	Rush
Cox (CA)	Krishnamoorthi	Sánchez	Luetkemeyer	Rutherford	Wenstrup	Courtney	Krishnamoorthi	Ryan
Craig	Kuster (NH)	Sarbanes	Marchant	Scalise	Westerman	Cox (CA)	Kuster (NH)	Sánchez
Crist	Langevin	Scanlon	Marshall	Schrader	Williams	Craig	Langevin	Sarbanes
Crow	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky	Mast	Schweikert	Wilson (SC)	Crist	Larsen (WA)	Scanlon
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Schiff	McAdams	Scott, Austin	Wittman	Crow	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
Cunningham	Lawrence	Schneider	McCarthy	Sensenbrenner	Womack	Cuellar	Lawrence	Schiff
Davids (KS)	Lawson (FL)	Schrier	McCaul	Shimkus	Woodall	Cunningham	Lawson (FL)	Schneider
Davidson (OH)	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)	McClintock	Simpson	Wright	Davids (KS)	Lee (CA)	Schradler
Davis (CA)	Lee (NV)	Scott, David	McHenry	Smith (MO)	Yoho	Davidson (OH)	Lee (NV)	Schrier
Davis, Danny K.	Levin (CA)	Serrano	MeKinley	Smith (NE)	Young	Davis (CA)	Levin (CA)	Schweikert
Dean	Levin (MI)	Sewell (AL)	Meadows	Smith (NJ)	Zeldin	Davis, Danny K.	Levin (MI)	Scott (VA)
DeFazio	Lewis	Shalala	Meuser	Smucker		Dean	Lewis	Scott, David
DeGette	Lieu, Ted	Sherman	Miller	Spano		DeFazio	Lieu, Ted	Serrano
DeLauro	Lipinski	Sherrill				DeGette	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)
DelBene	Loeb sack	Sires	Bergman	Kelly (MS)	Murphy (NC)	DeLauro	Loeb sack	Shalala
Delgado	Lofgren	Slotkin	Boyle, Brendan	King (IA)	Olson	DelBene	Lofgren	Sherman
Demings	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)	F.	Kinzing	Roe, David P.	Demings	Lowenthal	Sherrill
DeSaulnier	Lujan	Soto	Buck	Kirkpatrick	Rogers (AL)	DeSaulnier	Lujan	Sires
Dingell	Lynch	Spanberger	Byrne	Loudermilk	Rooney (FL)	Deutch	Lynch	Slotkin
Doggett	Malinowski	Stanton	Granger	Luria	Speier	Dingell	Malinowski	Smith (WA)
Doyle, Michael	Maloney,	Stevens	Heck	Mitchell	Stivers	Doggett	Maloney,	Soto
F.	Carolyn B.	Suo zzi	Higgins (LA)	Moolenaar	Walberg	Doyle, Michael	Carolyn B.	Spanberger
Engel	Maloney, Sean	Swalwell (CA)	Huizenga	Mullin	Walker	F.	Maloney, Sean	Stanton
Escobar	Massie	Takano				Engel	Massie	Stevens
Eshoo	Matsui	Thompson (CA)				Escobar	Matsui	Suo zzi
Espallat	McBath	Thompson (MS)				Eshoo	McAdams	Swalwell (CA)
Evans	McCollum	Titus				Espallat	McBath	Takano
Finkenauer	McEachin	Tlaib				Evans	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Fletcher	McGovern	Tonko				Finkenauer	McEachin	Thompson (MS)
Foster	McNerney	Torres (CA)				Fletcher	McGovern	Titus
Frankel	Meeks	Torres Small				Foster	McNerney	Tlaib
Fudge	Meng	(NM)				Frankel	Meeks	Tonko
Gabbard	Moore	Torres Small				Fudge	Meng	Torres (CA)
Gaetz	Morelle	Trane				Gabbard	Mooney (WV)	Torres Small
Gallego	Moulton	Underwood				Gaetz	Moore	(NM)
Garamendi	Mucarsel-Powell	Vargas				Gallagher	Morelle	Trane
Garcia (IL)	Nadler	Veasey				Gallego	Moulton	Trone
Garcia (TX)	Napolitano	Vela				Garamendi	Mucarsel-Powell	Underwood
Golden	Neal	Velázquez				Garcia (IL)	Murphy (FL)	Upton
Gomez	Neguse	Visclosky				Garcia (TX)	Nadler	Vargas
Gonzalez (TX)	Norcross	Wasserman				Golden	Napolitano	Veasey
Gottheimer	O'Halleran	Schultz				Gomez	Neal	Vela
Green, Al (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez	Waters				Gonzalez (TX)	Neguse	Velázquez
Grijalva	Omar	Watson Coleman				Gottheimer	Norcross	Visclosky
Haaland	Pallone	Welch				Green, Al (TX)	O'Halleran	Wasserman
Harder (CA)	Panetta	Wexton				Grijalva	Ocasio-Cortez	Schultz
Hastings	Pappas	Wilson (FL)				Haaland	Omar	Waters
Hayes	Pascrell	Yarmuth				Harder (CA)	Pallone	Watson Coleman
Higgins (NY)	Payne					Hastings	Panetta	Welch
Himes						Hayes	Pappas	Wexton
						Herrera Beutler	Pascrell	Wilson (FL)
						Higgins (NY)	Payne	Yarmuth

NAYS—175

Abraham	Carter (GA)	Foxx (NC)
Aderholt	Carter (TX)	Fulcher
Allen	Chabot	Gallagher
Amodei	Cheney	Gianforte
Armstrong	Cline	Gibbs
Arrington	Cloud	Gohmert
Babin	Cole	Gonzalez (OH)
Bacon	Collins (GA)	Gooden
Baird	Comer	Gosar
Balderson	Conaway	Graves (GA)
Banks	Cook	Graves (LA)
Barr	Crawford	Graves (MO)
Biggs	Crenshaw	Green (TN)
Bilirakis	Curtis	Griffith
Bishop (NC)	Davis, Rodney	Grothman
Bishop (UT)	DesJarlais	Guest
Bost	Diaz-Balart	Guthrie
Brady	Duncan	Hagedorn
Brooks (AL)	Dunn	Harris
Brooks (IN)	Emmer	Hartzler
Buchanan	Estes	Hern, Kevin
Buchon	Ferguson	Herrera Beutler
Budd	Fitzpatrick	Hice (GA)
Burchett	Fleischmann	Hill (AR)
Burgess	Flores	Holding
Calvert	Fortenberry	Hudson

NOT VOTING—26

□ 1243

Mr. RUIZ changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the first portion of the divided question was adopted.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MERCHANT MARINERS OF WORLD WAR II CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on concurring in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 550) to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Merchant Mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II, with the House amendment specified in section 4(b) of House Resolution 811, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 166, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—236

Adams	Beatty	Bonamici
Agullar	Bera	Brindisi
Allred	Beyer	Brown (MD)
Amash	Biggs	Brownley (CA)
Axne	Bishop (GA)	Bustos
Barragan	Blumenauer	Butterfield
Bass	Blunt Rochester	Carbajal

NAYS—166

Abraham	Calvert	Flores
Aderholt	Carter (TX)	Fortenberry
Allen	Chabot	Foxx (NC)
Amodei	Cheney	Fulcher
Armstrong	Cline	Gianforte
Arrington	Cole	Gibbs
Babin	Collins (GA)	Gohmert
Bacon	Comer	Gonzalez (OH)
Baird	Conaway	Gooden
Balderson	Cook	Gosar
Banks	Cooper	Graves (GA)
Barr	Crawford	Graves (LA)
Bilirakis	Crenshaw	Graves (MO)
Bishop (NC)	Curtis	Green (TN)
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Rodney	Griffith
Bost	DesJarlais	Grothman
Brady	Diaz-Balart	Guest
Brooks (AL)	Duncan	Guthrie
Brooks (IN)	Dunn	Hagedorn
Buchanan	Emmer	Harris
Buchon	Estes	Hartzler
Budd	Ferguson	Hern, Kevin
Burchett	Fitzpatrick	Hice (GA)
Burgess	Fleischmann	Hill (AR)

Holding	Meadows	Stauber
Hollingsworth	Meuser	Stefanik
Hudson	Miller	Steil
Hurd (TX)	Newhouse	Steube
Johnson (LA)	Norman	Stewart
Johnson (OH)	Nunes	Taylor
Johnson (SD)	Palazzo	Thompson (PA)
Jordan	Palmer	Thornberry
Joyce (OH)	Pence	Timmons
Joyce (PA)	Perry	Tipton
Katko	Posey	Turner
Keller	Ratcliffe	Van Drew
Kelly (PA)	Reed	Wagner
King (NY)	Reschenthaler	Walden
Kustoff (TN)	Rice (SC)	Walorski
LaHood	Riggleman	Waltz
LaMalfa	Roby	Watkins
Lamb	Rodgers (WA)	Weber (TX)
Lamborn	Rogers (KY)	Webster (FL)
Latta	Rose, John W.	Wenstrup
Lesko	Rouzer	Westerman
Long	Rutherford	Williams
Lucas	Scalise	Wilson (SC)
Luetkemeyer	Scott, Austin	Wittman
Marchant	Sensenbrenner	Womack
Marshall	Shimkus	Woodall
Mast	Simpson	Wright
McCarthy	Smith (MO)	Yoho
McCaul	Smith (NE)	Young
McClintock	Smith (NJ)	Zeldin
McHenry	Smucker	
McKinley	Spano	

NOT VOTING—27

Bergman	Kelly (MS)	Olson
Boyle, Brendan F.	King (IA)	Roe, David P.
Buck	Kinzinger	Rogers (AL)
Byrne	Kirkpatrick	Rooney (FL)
Carter (GA)	Loudermilk	Speier
Granger	Luria	Stivers
Heck	Mitchell	Walberg
Higgins (LA)	Moolenaar	Walker
Huizenga	Mullin	
	Murphy (NC)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1254

So the second portion of the divided question was adopted.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 33 and "yea" on rollcall No. 34.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I was absent today due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted: "yea" on rollcall No. 33 and "yea" on rollcall No. 34.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I was unable to vote on January 30, 2020, because of the need to travel back to Iowa. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: "no" on rollcall No. 33; "no" on rollcall No. 34.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, due to a family issue, I was unable to make today's votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 33 and "nay" on rollcall No. 34.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Speaker, due to an unavoidable and unforeseen scheduling conflict, I am not recorded on Roll Call 33 and Roll Call 34. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 33 and "nay" on rollcall No. 34.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, on Roll Call Votes No. 33 and No. 34, I am not re-

corded because I was absent from the House of Representatives. Had I been present, I would have voted: "nay" on rollcall No. 33 and "nay" on rollcall No. 34.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2382

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2382.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HAYES). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 1075

Mr. TRONE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 1075, a bill originally introduced by Representative Cummings of Maryland, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

□ 1300

COMMEMORATING 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF AUSCHWITZ

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, this week we commemorate the 75th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz and honor Holocaust survivors and those who lost their lives during this terrible period of history. Horrible atrocities were visited upon millions of innocent souls, driven by fear, hatred and oppression.

Seventy-five years later, as anti-Semitism, racism, and other forms of bigotry continue to plague our society, we are reminded that we cannot be silent in the face of intolerance or discrimination.

Earlier this week, I was proud to support the Never Again Education Act, which will help educate the next generation about the genocide that occurred during the Holocaust and the dangers of allowing hatred to go unchallenged.

As we reflect on this moment in history, let us set an example by condemning senseless acts of aggression and intolerance and, instead, encouraging equality and inclusion and honoring our enduring pledge: "Never Again."

RECOGNIZING SHUBHANKAR BALIYAN, PENNSYLVANIA'S 10TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT 2019 CONGRESSIONAL APP CHALLENGE WINNER

(Mr. PERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Shubhankar Baliyan as the winner of the 2019 Congressional App Challenge for the 10th District of Pennsylvania.

Shubhankar is a student at Cumberland Valley High School in Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, and submitted the winning app called ExciteMath. It is an application designed to help elementary-aged students practice basic, mental math skills in a fun and engaging way.

In each level of the app, students are given a target range or sum, that their final number must fall within and a specific number of hits they must use during that round. The student must then maneuver around falling numbers and select which to add or subtract from their sum for that round.

A panel of experts selected ExciteMath as the winner for its creativity, coding proficiency, and functionality. Through this app, Shubhankar also demonstrated a desire to give back to our community by helping children struggling with mathematics.

I congratulate Shubhankar on a job well done and look forward to seeing his app displayed right here in the Capitol.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, JANUARY 30, 2020, TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2020; AND HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2020

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 1:30 p.m. on Monday next, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at noon on Tuesday, February 4, 2020 for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF KEITH LAMONT STITH

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Keith Lamont Stith for becoming the first African American Chief of Detectives of the Criminal Investigation Division of the Hudson County Prosecutor's Office.

Mr. Stith brings more than 2 decades of accomplishments and experience in

law enforcement to the position. For the last 3 years, he was the deputy chief for the prosecutor's office; and in that role, he managed the daily investigation operations of the Criminal Investigation Division.

In the past, he has worked as a narcotics detective and for the U.S. Customs Service in their Financial Crimes Task Force.

He has done groundbreaking work to reduce gang and gun violence, as well as rehabilitate convicted criminals in Hudson County.

Also, he is a graduate of the prestigious FBI National Academy.

With these extraordinary credentials, I think Mr. Stith will be an exceptional chief of detectives in Hudson County.

POSTHUMOUS RECOGNITION OF THE SERVICE OF CARLTON HAND

(Mr. VAN DREW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I would like to posthumously recognize the heroic efforts of Carlton Hand, of Rio Grande in south Jersey.

Carlton Hand was a Technical Sergeant, Infantry, Cannon Company, 349th Infantry. Hand was recognized for his gallantry in combat. He stormed an entrenched German position in the face of heavy enemy sniper fire, grenades and mortar shells blasting all around them.

With snipers shooting at them, Carlton Hand abandoned his radio, secured grenades from one of his comrades, and killed two attacking Germans. He then seized a rifle in the face of continuing mortar and sniper fire, and killed two, and wounded one more German.

Germans then dropped grenades on his position, which he then proceeded to hurl back at the enemy. He then captured 20 prisoners in the seizure of the enemy position.

Carlton Hand was awarded the Silver Star Medal for Valor for his heroic efforts. Carlton Hand is the definition of an American hero, and we owe our future to the brave actions of Carlton Hand and the men and women like him who have shaped this great United States of America.

Our country was forged by the blood, sweat, and tears of brave men and women like Carlton Hand.

May God bless them as they look down upon us.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF MICHAEL LECIK

(Ms. SPANBERGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the selflessness, courage, and resilience of my constituent, Mike Lecik.

Mike served in the United States Air Force and deployed twice to the Middle

East as a military firefighter. After returning home to Powhatan County, he was diagnosed with multiple myeloma, a blood cancer linked to the carcinogenic conditions of his work.

The VA does not currently recognize the service connection between firefighting and diseases such as myeloma, leaving many veterans like Mike unable to get the care they need.

Since his diagnosis, Mike, and his wife, Tiffany, and their family have demonstrated incredible strength, and I am deeply inspired by his commitment to ensuring that no other military firefighters face these same challenges.

In his service overseas and through his advocacy at home, Mike represents the best of Virginia's Seventh District. Driven by his story and in coordination with Mike, I recently introduced the Michael Lecik Military Firefighters Protection Act. This bill would recognize cancer, lung disease, and other serious illnesses as presumptive service-connected disabilities for our Nation's veteran military firefighters.

I thank Mike for his tireless work on this issue, and I thank my colleague, Congressman BACON, for joining me in this effort to do right by the thousands of veterans and their families, people like my constituent, Mike Lecik.

THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE

(Mr. CLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, the opioid epidemic does not discriminate based on age, race, sex or socioeconomic status. It is a plague that affects Americans in all regions of the country, including Virginia's Sixth Congressional District.

In 2016, the United States experienced an astonishing 60,000 deaths related to drug overdose; nearly two-thirds of which involved opioids. That means that more than 91 Americans die from an opioid overdose every day, making it the leading cause of death for people under the age of 50.

This crisis is being fueled in part by a synthetic opioid known as fentanyl, a drug 80 to 100 times more powerful than morphine. In 2018 alone, more than 800 people died from fentanyl overdoses in Virginia.

I applaud my colleagues for voting to save lives this week by renewing the classification of fentanyl as a Schedule I narcotic.

Through commonsense solutions like this and support for first responders and treatment programs, I am confident we can help our fellow Americans struggling with opioid abuse and end this insidious epidemic.

REMEMBERING 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF AUSCHWITZ

(Mrs. MILLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MILLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of the 75th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz Concentration Camp.

I grew up in a Jewish community, alongside children of Holocaust survivors. It was something that was so real and so close. Following the liberation of Auschwitz and the devastation of the Holocaust, we must never forget the tragedy that happens when religious persecution goes unchecked.

We need to remember the six million heartbreaking deaths of our Jewish brothers and sisters around the world to ensure that they are never forgotten. We must teach our next generation about the horrors of the Holocaust to ensure that it will never happen again.

We must speak out, now and forever, against religious oppression, against anti-Semitism, and against radical extremism.

We have all been taught the Golden Rule and we all should live by it.

WAR IS VIOLENT AND CATASTROPHIC

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, war is a violent and catastrophic act, and its impact on the people of any nation is one that is long-lasting.

Between the wars of Iraq and Afghanistan, close to 7,000 Americans lost their lives; families were broken. But yet, we honor them for their service, as we honor those who are now serving and who have put on the uniform unselfishly, just like the young men and women who were called immediately after the killing of General Soleimani.

Today, we made an important statement on this floor; that is that the Constitution prevails; the rule of law prevails, as we hope it will prevail in the other body in this proceeding.

We know that Congress declares war. If there is danger, the President can use the War Powers Resolution. But as we did not find weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, we have an endless war.

We do not need to engage in a war with Iran. If we are attacked or there are hostilities, we can defend ourselves.

Let us deliberate on behalf of the American people and do it the right way.

To our military, we thank you for your service.

CELEBRATING A NEW CHAPTER FOR MINNESOTA'S LIBERIAN COMMUNITY

(Mr. EMMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Liberian community in Minnesota and throughout the United States, as they celebrate passage of the Liberian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act. This act provides a lifeline to certainty for Liberians around the country, bringing relief and clarity to so many families and communities throughout my district and home State.

Adoption of this important legislation is credited to the hard work of the many advocates who lived in a constant state of limbo and under the threat of the unknown for many years. Thank you to all our community members who banded together to advocate for our Liberian American friends and neighbors.

I am pleased that Congress, the administration, and President Trump have finally provided our Liberian Americans, our neighbors, and our friends, the clarity and protection they deserve.

ATROCITIES IN IDLIB, SYRIA

(Mr. RASKIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, there is another unfolding humanitarian crisis in Syria, this time in Idlib province. Syrian President Bashar al-Assad has launched an all-out assault on the province, aided by Vladimir Putin's Russian forces.

More than a quarter of a million people, 80 percent of them women and children, have fled their homes to the northern part of Idlib into freezing desert and refugee camps, without adequate food, shelter, or medical care.

With the current death toll of the Syrian civil war estimated to exceed 500,000, along with six million people internally displaced, humanitarian groups are concerned that the siege of Idlib will result in the largest humanitarian disaster yet seen in the country.

This assault is a replay of the siege of Aleppo as the government again bombs civilian targets like hospitals, schools, markets and people's homes.

This disaster will only be compounded as a result of Russia vetoing a U.N. Security Council resolution allowing cross-border aid to Syrian refugees. Although a modified resolution was adopted, cross-border aid has been restricted and may come to an end this summer if Russia and Syria continue to push for its elimination.

As U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Kelly Craft said: "Syrians will suffer needlessly as a result of this resolution."

□ 1315

SUPPORTING NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my support for National School Choice Week.

Every American enjoys choices, and, indeed, it is the American way; yet, when it comes to educating our children, one size fits all seems to be the norm—and is even forced upon families.

Every family, regardless of their background, should be able to choose an educational option that is right for the needs of their children, whether that is traditional public schools, charter schools, magnet schools, private schools, or other alternatives.

There is plenty of evidence to suggest that, when a family can choose a school based on their own children's needs, there is an increase in college readiness and success in life after graduation.

If we expect today's students to become tomorrow's world leaders, we should give them every opportunity to learn and grow and thrive, to have choices that work for them, not for the government and not for special interests.

Expanding school choice is the most viable option to prepare students for success.

COMMEMORATING 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE END OF DEATH CAMPS

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, last week, I went with Speaker PELOSI and some other Members of Congress to Jerusalem, where we had the commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the end of the death camps. Many of our colleagues went to Auschwitz-Birkenau to look at the concentration camps.

Some of my colleagues have said this, but I think it is important that each one of us says it: We have to raise our voices loudly and clearly and monitor the situation so these types of things don't happen again to any people.

First of all, anti-Semitism is rearing its ugly head, and certainly we need to do everything we can to stop the scourge of anti-Semitism. We cannot treat people the way the Jewish population was treated during the Second World War, and America must always be in the forefront of equal rights and standing up against injustice.

I wanted to take the time to say that participating in that conference was really emotional for me, and I think that we should always say: Never again will we stand idly by and allow anti-Semitism to rear its ugly head. Never again will we stand idly by and allow any group of people to be killed and slaughtered.

So, never again.

DISCUSSING ECONOMIC DATA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2019, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH).

HONORING THE LIFE OF LORILEE WARD

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Madam Speaker, over the last few weeks, we have lost two Americans about whom I want to, here, speak.

Earlier this month, we lost a valued member of our southern Indiana community. Lorilee Ward from Clarksville died of cancer. All of us, her friends, her family, are devastated by her loss, and the outpouring of support from fellow Hoosiers shows just how large a legacy Lorilee leaves behind in her wake created by that strong dedication she always had to her community and the values she so fervently believed in.

Lorilee's warmth and enthusiasm was a staple of our Clark County community. Lorilee served on the board of southern Indiana's Clark-Floyd Counties Convention Tourism Bureau, a group dedicated to bettering our neighbors. She furiously believed in the prosperity and future of our towns all the way across southern Indiana, and she gave liberally of her time and of her energy to make sure that we are all the best we can be.

For Lorilee, the future of our communities of Indiana and of our country rests in preserving and promoting our conservative values in principles like the value of all life; supporting our troops and veterans, which she did so passionately through her involvement in Wreaths Across America; economic opportunity and job creation; and putting America and Americans first.

Lorilee always fought to make sure our voices and values were heard. She served adamantly as the president of the Clark County Republican Women, a reliable and relentless volunteer for her President, and a member of our Indiana GOP. She did it all on behalf of others, knowing that she was fighting for bettering the lives of future generations.

Southern Indiana will not be the same, both because of her work and because of our loss.

Lorilee's mighty spirit shown through in all she did. Lorilee has always been a fighter. At the age of 18, Lorilee was diagnosed with stage 4 non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, and she was told by her doctors that the end was near, that she should expect the worst. But Lorilee did not expect the worst. She fought for the best. She fought for her future and lived another 37 years.

Despite the challenges she faced, Lorilee had a smile on her face every day and went through life with a positive energy that inspired everyone around her. Lorilee was truly a force of nature, and her death is a great loss.

It was once said that success in old age is having a crowded table, knowing that your friends, your family want to gather with you on special occasions

and spend time with you. This was especially true for Lorilee.

Lorilee, survived by her incredible family, was loved dearly by them. Lorilee put her family above everything else, and I know her husband of 25 years, Donald; her two daughters, Chantelle and Darci; her father; her siblings; and her 14 grandchildren will miss her dearly. That, to me, sounds like a crowded table. That, to me, sounds like a great legacy.

Madam Speaker, may Lorilee rest in peace.

HONORING THE LIFE OF THOMAS LAVELL
SECREST

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Madam Speaker, Thomas Lavell Secrest passed away this week after a life full of service to his country.

Tom was born in Corpus Christi, Texas, and attended the U.S. Military Academy at West Point from 1966 to 1970. After graduation, Tom served in Germany and Fort Knox, achieving the rank of captain, as a tanker. Tom is remembered by his West Point classmates as a smart and kind guy.

After his service in the Army, Tom returned to Texas to attend law school at the University of Texas and then went on to a very successful legal career in New York City. Over his career, Tom represented Polaroid, AT&T, Lucent, and Hunter Douglas in defending their intellectual property. Tom's demand for uncompromised performance was evident in every pursuit of his life: academic, military, professional, and personal.

Tom spent the last few years of his life in South Carolina with his beloved wife, Liz, where they enjoyed their mutual passion for golf. Throughout their marriage, they also ensured that their friends, their family could participate in their love for golf, including Golf Magazine's editor-in-chief, George Peper.

In 2002, George highlighted his friend Tom's spirit both on and off the golf course in an article that tells you exactly who he was: an ardent believer in hard work, a fiercely loyal friend, husband, and father. He was someone who never missed an opportunity to hit the links. And while always staying humble, Tom's golf game was legendary.

A golfer once said that many golfers argue very frequently, very vigorously about where they played or which course was the best; but, at the end of their lives, what they will remember is with whom they played. Tom truly embodied this by always remembering it was with whom you played that mattered most. He played with his favorite friends, his family.

He is survived by his wife, his son, his daughter-in-law, his brothers, his nieces, his nephews, and his grandchildren. I know each of them will miss him dearly but will carry on the legacy of earnestness and humor that he instilled in each of them.

Tom is someone whom those around him could always rely on, but he was taken from us far too soon. Our country

and his family are better off because of his life, because of his service, and because of his spirit.

Madam Speaker, may Tom rest in peace.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I am going to come down to the lower microphone because we are going to be using a number of slides, and I want to apologize right now, this one is going to be a little thick. We are actually going to do some information in regard to what CBO put out this week and some other economic data and try to put it in perspective. So let me come on down.

I get teased all the time about the charts and the fact that I can't even get my wife to now watch me do these because she says I am boring, but it is important.

Madam Speaker, what I am going to try to do today—and let's see if I can do it as well as possible. I want to walk through what is a little bit of sort of the political folklore that we engage in here about the math when we talk about the deficits and the debt and the economic future and when you hear people say things like the debt as compared to the size of the economy and what is driving it, because, if we don't actually sort of get our act together here and start to become honest about just the math and what is driving it, we can't put together policy.

I am incredibly optimistic that there is a path where we can digest the realities of these costs that happen from our demographics, because we are a society that is getting old really fast, but we do politics now.

The other day, I am home and I am watching a little bit of one of the Presidential forums. It is a candidate on the Democrat side running for President from the Midwest, and his first comment was: These deficits, this trillion-dollar deficit we are going to have next year, that is because of tax reform.

It just breaks your heart because you know these individuals are smart, and have we hit this world where, as Republicans—and please understand, I beat up both sides—as Republicans, we had this history of saying: Well, the debt and deficit comes from waste and fraud.

The left often said: We don't tax rich people enough.

All that is lunacy, and the investment in a calculator here would really go a long way.

First, I brought a number of boards because, heaven knows, I am incapable of speaking without my charts.

This, right here, is the change in receipts to the Federal Government. Revenues are up, and they are up fairly substantially since tax reform.

Do you understand last fiscal year revenues were up over 4 percent? With the size of our economy, that is actually a big deal. Our problem is we increased spending just shy of 8 percent.

Does anyone see a small math problem there?

Our projection is we will take in over \$3.6 trillion in the fiscal year we are in right now. Last year, revenues were about \$3.462 trillion. That is a fairly substantial increase in these revenues, but how can we keep running these massive deficits?

Well, it turns out it is spending, but it is spending on what we call the mandatory side, the formulas that we don't get to vote on and we are terrified as elected officials to talk about.

I am going to walk us through part of this math. First, let's do some of the positive stuff, and then let's get to the really difficult policy issues.

So, revenues are up, and they are going up fairly substantially. A lot of this economic growth and receipts is payroll taxes. It is because we are having a remarkable period here of employment.

When you look at what we call the U-6 data put out by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the number of our brothers and sisters who weren't even looking for work that are moving into the labor force and all the sudden now are paying payroll taxes, Social Security, Medicare, these things, is remarkable.

We should actually, as a society, be joyful, both those on the left and those on the right. We should be joyful because, if I had come into this room 3 years ago and said we are living in a time where we have more jobs than people, we are going to live in a time where it actually turns out to be our brothers and sisters who are functionally defined as the working poor have the fastest growing wages, double what the mean is—this has been our goal around here for years, and it is not a Democratic goal or a Republican goal. It just should be a goal of lifting people up, and it is happening. So let's take some joy in that. And it turns out it is also helping the receipts here to the Federal Government.

There are other things that we should be joyful about.

When you actually look at this enhanced period of economic stability, what happens when what we call the real net worth—the value of your homes, the value of your savings, the value of your investments, the value of things you hold—well, it turns out the bottom 50 percent, their real net worth has gone up fairly substantially, over 15 percent in these last 3 years. That is a big deal.

But then I will get folks who will just make up stuff. Well, the rich are the ones. Well, it turns out that is not true.

□ 1330

The top 1 percent aren't having most of that growth in their personal wealth. It is the bottom 50 percent is where most of the growth is.

Can we take some joy in that? This is one of the most unique economic cycles because it has been so stable for so long. You also have the GDP numbers that came out today basically saying:

Hey, looks like we are just going to be in a steady, healthy environment.

We really need this because you get really positive math when you hit this type of economic stability.

All right, last one on this. When you look at what we call real wage growth, who are seeing their incomes go up? I know this is thick, but the politics—and I accept that we are in an election year, but we have to stop—what do you call that? Oh, yeah—lying.

The fact of the matter is it isn't the top income earners who are seeing the most actual movement in their wages.

Take a look at this red line. That is what is really going on right now. The blue is what we thought was going to happen. You see that inflection point.

I have been on the Joint Economic Committee for years now, and it was only about 3 years ago we were having some of the smartest economists, the experts, coming in and saying: Well, you have to understand, Joint Economic Committee, those who don't have a high school education, those who have moderate skill sets, you need to prepare, because they will be part of the permanently poor, the permanent underclass of your country forever.

Then, all of a sudden, something has happened the last couple of years where their labor now has some of the most value in this economy. Look at the wage growth for our brothers and sisters who didn't graduate high school, who have moderate skill sets. That is where the substantial, almost double the growth of the mean is.

We should be joyful about this because all of those fancy economists who were in front of us just a couple of years ago said that it couldn't happen, that we should be planning for this to be a population that will have to live in a subsidized world for the rest of their lives. It turns out they were wrong.

We have sort of a family saying: Figure out what you do right and do more of it; figure out what you have done wrong and do less of it.

Maybe we should stop inviting those particular economists to come to testify in front of us.

Where is the trillion-dollar deficit coming from? Well, it is a combination of a bunch of things. This is one of the things that will frustrate you, particularly about Congress. We seem incapable of dealing with complexity because the solution to this is also really complex. We will sort of close on that.

This chart, it is almost impossible to read this chart, so I stole some notes from myself.

The point I am trying to make here is this is 2017, before tax reform, and where we are at today. The top one is net interest. It looks like our projection of what we are going to spend in interest costs has gone down and gone down fairly substantially.

The argument here is one of the things that happened in tax reform that we didn't expect is that savings rates are much better than we expected

and what they call repatriation, cash that has been coming in from overseas—remember, we had that cycle for almost 20 years where businesses would move their headquarters out of the country and then keep their profits there because if they brought them in, they were substantially taxed in the United States. We made a deal with sort of the world and those businesses saying: Here will be the new tax rates. Bring your money in.

That money, I think, in our reports we had last summer, we were seeing about \$400 billion more than we had modeled for. I have not seen a more recent number, but there is an argument that we are afloat with cash in North America, in the United States, and that drives interest rates down.

Is that a first- or second-degree effect? Let's not geek out too much on that.

But take a look here. Let's use, like, 72 percent of the budget, of our spending here. It is what we call mandatory. It is on autopilot.

The other portion is what we call discretionary. About half of that is defense, and about half of that is everything else you think of as government, from the Park Service to the FDA to this and that. That is the other, let's call it 14, 15 percent of government. That is what we vote on, the discretionary side.

Take a look at this. Where you see that little orange bar, you see that big piece of growth. Those are things we have voted on in just the last 2 years, and it is up substantially.

We have some other charts I am going to show you that if you look at the growth in deficit—not debt, the deficits from this year, even the next couple of years—a big driver of it is our own votes. It is the discretionary side.

This here is the growth in mandatory, and there is something wonderful about this. Do you notice that it is getting smaller? I know these look like tiny, little increments, but when you are talking about a trillion dollars, that is a lot of money.

It turns out, because of the economic expansion, we are seeing a reduction in some of the demands for entitlements.

We always have to be careful when we talk about this because this is sort of the—what is the term?—third rail for a lot of us who are elected officials to explain this.

There are earned entitlements. You earned your Social Security; you earned your Medicare; you earned your military pension. Those are earned entitlements. You paid for those. You earned them with your service and your contributions.

There are other types of entitlements that are part of this mandatory formula. It is a treaty obligation. You are part of a certain Native American population, other things. They are obligations we took on. Or you fell under a certain income. You know, you are having really rough times in your life, so there is certain income support or

access to certain healthcare or housing allowances and those things.

We haven't done all the analysis yet, but we think that is where part of this drop all of a sudden in mandatory spending has come from. As the economy is growing and we are seeing our brothers and sisters who were—the term is often marginally detached or detached from the workforce—are coming back in, all of a sudden, they are leaving certain programs. So that is another benefit we are seeing mathematically and budgetarily in the growth of the economy.

Is that a first-degree effect or second-degree effect from tax reform? Okay, fine.

Other spending, these are other types of programs that may have their own individual trust funds or those things, and you will take a look and notice that their spending is up just a little bit.

Here is where, when we talk about the tax reform, we see lower corporate taxes; we see substantially higher payroll taxes because people are working; and we see lower individual taxes.

When you have someone walk up behind one of these microphones and say, "Well, it was the tax reform. That is why we are"—no, it is not. Tax reform is part of it. I mean, we always modeled that tax reform was going to cost about \$1.4 trillion over 10 years.

If we could get the economic expansion and employment statistics, that number would come down. You all saw now—because I know everyone immediately grabbed their CBO update report—that from August to the report this week, there is a \$705 billion reduction in the deficit projection over the 10 years.

A lot of that, I think, are these first- and second-degree effects. Some of that was interest rates are lower, like you see up here in this top line, because people are saving more, and payroll taxes, which you see down over here, because more people are working.

I don't want to sound whiny up here and frustrated, but these numbers are complex. I will go through this three or four times with a highlighter to get my head around the numbers, and then I will turn to the freaky smart staff of the Joint Economic Committee and others to make sure we are understanding it correctly.

But I beg of my brothers and sisters who are elected or policymakers, stop spouting off in political terms, because if we can start to get an honest understanding of the math, maybe we can come up with some honest approaches on how to deal with the crushing level of debt that is coming at us.

Let's start walking through what is driving the deficits and the debt. One of the comments I heard the other day from an economist on I think it was CNBC—now, it was ideological. It was a politically liberal economist from a university: Well, if we could have some substantial cuts in defense, we would see all these changes in these deficits.

That is lunacy. Look, the model on defense is pretty flat and stable.

Here is a number I am going to give you two or three times, and I beg of you, I know a number of people don't want to hear this, but it is math: Just the growth of Social Security, Medicare, and healthcare entitlements over the next 5 years equals the entire Defense Department.

Is that Republican or Democrat? It is neither. It is demographics.

There are—what?—74 million of us who are baby boomers. We are about halfway moving into our retirement cycle, turning 65, qualifying for certain benefits. It is like Congress only just recently discovered there were baby boomers. But when you hear someone start to say something like, "Well, if we would just cut defense, all of a sudden the numbers are better," it is lunacy.

You could get rid of all of defense tomorrow, and it only gives you 5 years of the growth in Social Security, Medicare, healthcare entitlements. Why is it so hard to tell the truth?

Here is another one. This is sort of building a chart right out of CBO, Congressional Budget Office. CBO projects budget deficit rise is entirely—this is CBO—driven by soaring Social Security and Medicare shortfalls.

I know it is the third rail. I know we are not supposed to talk about it. But if you believe like I do, I believe it is a moral obligation to protect Social Security and Medicare. How can you step up to that ethical obligation and then not tell the truth about the math? You know, you can't fix a problem unless you are willing to accept it.

Look, the chart is the chart is the chart. This is from the nonpartisan arbiters of what is going on. It is demographics. And the sizes of these numbers are just devastatingly large.

Let's take a look at another one. There is a bunch of the tax reform that expires in the next couple of years, and we go back to other sort of tax rates and those things, but this one, we just pretend everything is permanent, that those revenue gains that are coming in a couple of years don't happen, assuming they would create multipliers in the economy, which they won't. They probably won't pay for themselves, but that is a completely different chart and models. This also misses a bunch of the expanded spending that happened late last year when we lifted some of the budgetary restriction caps.

But once again, 90 percent of the budgetary shortfall is Social Security, Medicare, healthcare entitlements, but mostly Medicare, yet this body is terrified to talk about that. It is the math.

One more on this, just to sort of get our head around it because I am frustrated, because for those of us who do believe there is a policy set, and I have been behind this microphone—and the poor folks who have to try to keep up with me. Tell me if I am starting to speak too quickly. I have had a lot of coffee today.

There is a way to get there. Now, when I say "get there," that means to sort of stay about 95 percent of debt to GDP and hold it as we wait for those of us who are baby boomers to meet our reward and go back to more normal population demographic numbers. This is hard, but it is the reality. Then we put this together.

And, I am sorry, we don't typically try to do something that is this blatant, but it is. This is one of the things that comes into our office, saying: "Well, if you would tax rich people more, you would be fine." It is lunacy. It only covers about 4.7 percent of—8.3 percent of GDP. It doesn't even cover close to half of the total shortfall when you put everything together.

□ 1345

The entire defense budget, if you get rid of that, we have already talked about that, it only covers 5 years of the growth in spending.

We actually have an entire chart list if anyone ever wants it. You are welcome to call our office where we actually have been laying out all of these proposals.

If we tax this bunch more, or Republicans, if we do this in waste and fraud, or this and that, and you start to see, we are talking about slivers that functionally have almost no impact. Because if you do them solo and not tie it in with lots of other economic growth dynamics, you don't get anywhere.

The last column is just things that are being proposed in the Presidential race. So we are talking about trillion-dollar deficits, and then you look at that last bar on this chart and those trillion-dollar deficits don't even have these things in it. That is about another 25.6 percent of GDP going to debt.

You can't get there. The fact of the matter is, the economy blows up a long time before that.

So, can we move back a little bit from the lunacy and actually sort of say: Okay, how do you get there? SCHWEIKERT, you keep coming to the microphone. You keep begging your Democrat colleagues and Republican colleagues to open up their minds and think more creatively—think with a calculator—actually, in some way optimistically. We joke in my office that I am 57 with a 4-year old. I am optimistic.

But first off, you have to grow. We have to grow like crazy. You do tax policy that maximizes economic growth. And we saw that in some of the earlier boards here when you see what is happening in the labor force participation and payroll taxes.

You will have to fix the immigration system. The economic modelers keep coming to us saying: A talent-based immigration system will give you much more economic lift.

We are going to have to also come up with policies that encourage family formation. Birth rates are collapsing in our country. And it turns out that that

has a really devastating effect over the coming decades in what happens in economic growth and we just need to be honest about that. But there are other things. So that is population stability.

There are other things you can do in economic growth. I am not happy with the term "deregulating." I argue that you need to move to a type of smart regulation. We all walk around with these super computers in our pocket, and we don't stop for a second to think what would happen if we actually started to use technology as part of our regulations.

There are arguments, like in financial markets, the ability to use technology to find bad actors, instead of the lunacy of the model used today, which is almost like a 1938 model where people fill out pieces of paper. They may email them in, but they are still filling out pieces of paper instead of using technology to watch the markets.

It turns out you could crowdsource data for water, for air, and so many of these things, and have instantaneous information if there is a bad actor in your environment. And it turns out it is dramatically less expensive because you don't have to be crushing each little business with regulations. If one of them screws up, you catch them immediately because you are using technology.

There are lots of ideas like this. They are not Republican. They are not Democrat. They are technology. But, yet, you have to be willing to take on the bureaucracy. And as a lot of us are learning around here, it is the bureaucracy now that basically runs Washington, D.C.

Technology disruptions. We need to have an honest discussion. You saw in the charts; Medicare is the primary driver of our debt. You have to be honest with it. How do you have a disruption in healthcare prices? And there are lots and lots of ideas that you are going to have to put together.

We had a meeting in our office earlier today. We were walking through the math on pharmaceuticals. Did you know the misuse or lack of use—which is misuse—of pharmaceuticals is over half a trillion dollars a year? Sixteen percent of all healthcare spending is because of the fact that people didn't take, or took too much, or screwed up taking their hypertension medicine, or other things.

But there is a simple technology solution. It turns out it is not in the pharmaceutical pricing. It is actually in the cap of the pharmaceutical bottle that says: "Hey, Bob, we calculate you did not take your hypertension medicine," and you ping the phone. You can do that for a couple of dollars. Or the thing that distributes pills to grandma who has to take two in the morning and one in the afternoon—this and that—and when she screws up, she ends up in the hospital. It is efficacy of when you take your pharmaceuticals.

What would happen if I could walk up and say, just changing this technology

platform is 16 percent of all U.S. healthcare spending? We have to be willing to think creatively and disruptively.

There is the thing you can blow into. It looks like a large kazoo and instantly tells you you have the flu; instantly can bang off your medical records; and instantly order your antivirals.

Would that make us healthier, more productive, less time getting sick? Of course, it would. Is that Republican or Democrat? It is just technology, except it is illegal. That type of technology today, the way our laws are set up, is illegal.

How do we actually drag in the willingness to engage in those disruptions? It is one of my running arguments. Should we have protected Blockbuster Video from Netflix? We love it when it comes into our home and makes our lives easier. But what happens when it makes many of our constituencies that are filling up the halls here lobbying us really nervous?

There are technology disruptions out there that could crash the price of healthcare and raise productivity and raise GDP. We know what they are. But the arrogance of this place often thinks we know what the future is, and we keep getting it wrong. So we need to legalize technology.

Employment. We still have a problem with millennial men. We have lots and lots of people who have gotten older who want to stay in the workforce. What do you do in programs to incentivize as many people as possible to be in the labor force?

It turns out to be simple ideas that I can't believe we can't come to an agreement on and we have been working on it for years; things like Social Security disability. Should someone say: "Oh, I got a job," boom, they hit the cliff and their benefits, and that sort of safety net goes away.

How do you actually smooth the off-ramp on these programs so it incentivizes people getting attached into the labor force? Because labor force attachment is one of the most powerful things you can ever do for someone's future and for the economy. That is true for lots of programs, even the earned entitlement.

Should we give you a spiff on Social Security and Medicare if you will stay in the labor force? Because as it turns out, you lower our costs. You lower society's costs.

So we really, really need to think about that. And that ties into the earned and unearned benefits of how do you build incentives in there to be part of the labor force to actually use the technologies that make your healthcare much less expensive but keep you healthier. How do we do those things? We know the policy, but this place seems to think about them in silos of: "Well, I have this piece of legislation that does this," instead of understanding it will be dozens of pieces of legislation that are complex. They

are politically difficult and have to be put together.

And the reason those are so important—I have been working on this model now for years saying, if we do everything here and do it right, the future is actually really bright. If we don't do it, we are crushing my little girl. We are crushing our country to just a time of anemic growth and crushing debt. At some point, Members of Congress and the armies of lobbyists in these hallways will have to step up and admit that we squandered the opportunity when we were in this time of just almost a miracle Goldilocks economy where things are stable.

If we are going to do this, this is the time to step up and make it work. But, yet, this has been a couple of years that I have come behind this microphone, and I will get one or two offices that will reach out and want some of the slides and some of the backup information.

I will have—probably next week—certain associations, lobbyists come marching into my office and saying: "David, you can't talk about technology that way. Don't you understand, you are going to screw up our business model?"

We have got to get honest. We know the math. We know how devastating it gets. And just to make a point, before tax reform, CBO was still predicting in these next couple of years we are going to have trillion-dollar deficits. We have known this is coming. The game here is to find someone or something to blame.

How about actually starting to expect us to start offering solutions? That is why I am behind this microphone. There is a path. It will be hard. It will be complex, but there is a path where it works.

Let's try it.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 3, 2020, at 1:30 p.m.

RULES AND REPORTS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT

[Omitted from the Record of January 29, 2020]

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(d), executive communications [final rules] submitted to the House pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1) during the period of September 13, 2019, through January 3, 2020, shall be treated as though received on January 29, 2020. Original dates of transmittal, numberings, and referrals to committee of those executive communications remain as indicated in the Executive Communication section of the relevant CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3678. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Approval of Laboratories To Conduct Official Testing; Consolidation of Regulations [Docket No.: APHIS-2016-0054] (RIN: 0579-AE46) received January 28, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3679. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2016 Report to Congress on Community Services Block Grant Discretionary Activities — Community Economic Development and Rural Community Development Programs, pursuant to Sec. 680(c) of Public Law 97-35, and Public Law 105-285; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3680. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a renewed determination that a public health emergency exists nationwide as a result of the consequences of the opioid crisis, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 247d(a); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title III, Sec. 319(a) (as amended by Public Law 107-188, Sec. 144(a)); (116 Stat. 630); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3681. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification related to Condition 7(C)(i) of Senate Executive Resolution 75 (1997) Concerning Advice and Consent to the Ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3682. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Prevailing Rate Systems; Definition of Johnson County, Indiana, to a Nonappropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Area (RIN: 3206-AN93) received January 28, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3683. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of Certain Appropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Areas (RIN: 3206-AN87) received January 28, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3684. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustments (NPS-WASO-NAGPRA-29542; PPWOVPADU0/PPMPRL1Y.Y00000) (RIN: 1024-AE60) received January 29, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CRIST (for himself and Mr. RESCHENTHALER):

H.R. 5715. A bill to improve honesty in pet sales, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the

Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia):

H.R. 5716. A bill to reduce, from 21 years of age to 18 years of age, the minimum age at which a person may obtain a handgun from a Federal firearms licensee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. DELAUNO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. NEAL, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 5717. A bill to end the epidemic of gun violence and build safer communities by strengthening Federal firearms laws and supporting gun violence research, intervention, and prevention initiatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 5718. A bill to establish a refund effective date for rates and charges under the Natural Gas Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 5719. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to modify the standards to determine eligibility to receive supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 5720. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to prohibit the creation and sale of trigger leads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 5721. A bill to apply user fees with respect to tobacco products deemed subject to the requirements of chapter IX of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 5722. A bill to require reporting of bullying to appropriate authorities and assist with equal protection claims against entities who fail to respond appropriately to bullying, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. DELAUNO:

H.R. 5723. A bill to make a supplemental appropriation for the Public Health Emergency Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 5724. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to develop objectives and performance measures for provision by the Department of Veterans Affairs of same-day services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 5725. A bill to impose sanctions under the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act to combat the suppression of the freedoms of speech, association, assembly, procession, and demonstration of the people of Hong Kong, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER (for himself and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 5726. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow, in certain cases, an increase in the limitation on the exclusion for gains from a sale or exchange of a principal residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. BARRAGAN):

H.R. 5727. A bill to provide for a study by the National Academy of Medicine on ambulance diversions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 5728. A bill to provide for the regulation, inspection, and labeling of food produced using animal cell culture technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 5729. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for increasing seasonal influenza vaccination rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 5730. A bill to direct the Homeland Security Council and the National Security Council, in consultation with Federal departments and agencies responsible for bio-defense, to update the National Strategy for Pandemic Influenza, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MALINOWSKI (for himself, Mr. SIRE, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 5731. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for a program dashboard for the fixed guideway capital investment grants program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MAST (for himself, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. ALLRED, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana):

H.R. 5732. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to study the feasibility of establishing a pilot program to assign certain officers of the Armed Forces to serve as directors of medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans'

Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 5733. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended to waive the application of the Act to agents representing foreign enterprises which are not under the control or direction of foreign governments or foreign political parties, to exclude agents who represent foreign governments which engage in a pattern of gross violations of human rights from the exemption provided under the Act for agents engaged in scholastic and certain other pursuits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. OMAR:

H.R. 5734. A bill to repeal the Alien Enemies Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself and Mrs. ROBY):

H.R. 5735. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow certain senior employees in the judicial branch of Government to carry over up to 90 days of annual leave each year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROSE of New York:

H.R. 5736. A bill to direct the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security to develop and disseminate a threat assessment regarding threats to the United States associated with foreign violent white supremacist extremist organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HECK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 5737. A bill to expand the authorization of voluntary Federal grazing permit retirement, provide increased flexibility for Federal grazing permittees, promote the equitable resolution or avoidance of conflicts on Federal lands managed by the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. BACON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 5738. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to implement a safe-to-report policy applicable across the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. KATKO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. QUIGLEY, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H.R. 5739. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a presumption of service-connection of disabilities relating to blast exposures with respect to disability compensation payments by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 5740. A bill to combat child human trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition

to the Committees on Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ (for herself, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. WILD, Ms. WEXTON, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.J. Res. 84. A joint resolution expressing support for designation of the week of February 3, 2020, through February 7, 2020, as “National School Counseling Week”; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, and Mr. HUDSON):

H. Res. 818. A resolution expressing support for a balanced budget; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. Res. 819. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Authorization for Use of Military Force and the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 do not provide legal justification for war with Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. CASE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. CORREA, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. SOTO, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. VELA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H. Res. 820. A resolution expressing support for designation of February 2020 as National Citizenship Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H. Res. 821. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to establish a Permanent Select Committee on Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CORREA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. COX of California, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H. Res. 822. A resolution urging Tom Flores be inducted into the Pro Football Hall of Fame; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MEEKS, and Mrs. WAGNER):

H. Res. 823. A resolution condemning the Government of Iran’s state-sponsored persecution of its Baha’i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O’HALLERAN (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KILMER, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

H. Res. 824. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week beginning February 2, 2020, as “National Tribal Colleges

and Universities Week”; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. SHERMAN (for himself, Mr. BANKS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. BERA, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. YOHO, and Ms. SPANBERGER):

H. Res. 825. A resolution celebrating the 50th anniversary of the entry into force of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), recognizing the importance of the NPT’s continued contributions to United States and international security, and commemorating United States leadership in strengthening the nuclear non-proliferation regime since the dawn of the nuclear era; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CRIST:

H.R. 5715.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 5716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Second Amendment to the United States Constitution, which recognizes the right to bear arms.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 5717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section Eight

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 5718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.

By Mr. ARRINGTON:

H.R. 5719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 5720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 5721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5722.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5723.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 5724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 5725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 5726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 5727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 5728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 5729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1 “all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.”

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 5730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1 “all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.”

By Mr. MALINOWSKI:

H.R. 5731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 5732.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Necessary and Proper Clause in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution “To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces”

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 5733.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. OMAR:

H.R. 5734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 To make all laws that shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. RASKIN:

H.R. 5735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ROSE of New York:

H.R. 5736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the power “to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 5737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV Section 3. “The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all ndful Rules and Regulations respecting teh Territory or other Property belonging to the United States . . .”

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 5738.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 5739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 5740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ:

H.J. Res. 84.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 141: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 307: Mr. DELGADO.
H.R. 584: Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. CLAY, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. NEGUSE, and Ms. ESCOBAR.
H.R. 587: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 779: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. EMMER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 784: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 832: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 906: Mr. HECK, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 969: Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 980: Mr. HECK.
H.R. 1043: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 1049: Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DELGADO, Ms. ADAMS, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. WEXTON, and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 1151: Ms. GABBARD and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1236: Mr. DELGADO.
H.R. 1266: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 1374: Mr. KELLER.
H.R. 1379: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. TIMMONS.
H.R. 1440: Mr. DELGADO.
H.R. 1521: Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 1587: Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 1611: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1643: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1693: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 1695: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 1711: Mrs. BUSTOS and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1749: Mr. GOODEN.
H.R. 1766: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 1869: Mrs. MILLER.
H.R. 1884: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 1897: Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 1903: Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 1953: Mr. HECK.
H.R. 1975: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 1978: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1987: Mr. STAUBER and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 2117: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2166: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 2177: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.
H.R. 2283: Mr. WELCH and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 2339: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2350: Mr. HECK.
H.R. 2453: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 2456: Mr. SOTO and Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 2457: Mr. HECK.
H.R. 2491: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 2501: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 2593: Mrs. MILLER.
H.R. 2653: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2694: Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 2742: Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 2770: Mr. KIM.
H.R. 2850: Mr. MALINOWSKI.
H.R. 2912: Mr. BALDERSON, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2931: Mr. MALINOWSKI.
H.R. 2953: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 2986: Mr. MEUSER.
H.R. 3077: Mr. GIANFORTE.
H.R. 3114: Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 3133: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3138: Mr. HECK.
H.R. 3214: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 3252: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 3254: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 3307: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3350: Mr. DELGADO.
H.R. 3451: Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 3489: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 3570: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 3576: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 3582: Mr. MALINOWSKI.
H.R. 3591: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 3735: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 3757: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 3815: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3923: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 4128: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 4137: Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 4138: Mr. MCADAMS and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4145: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 4148: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 4165: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 4189: Mr. SOTO, Mrs. AXNE, and Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 4211: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 4248: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 4305: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.
H.R. 4350: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.
H.R. 4508: Mr. WALTZ.
H.R. 4540: Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CRIST, and Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 4542: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 4574: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 4575: Mr. KILMER and Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 4674: Mr. CUELLAR and Mrs. MCBATH.
H.R. 4681: Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 4697: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4707: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 4807: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 4836: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 4867: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 4928: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 4930: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 4963: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 4996: Mr. MCEACHIN.
H.R. 5002: Mr. HECK, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HURD of Texas, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 5036: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 5044: Mr. HECK.
H.R. 5046: Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 5048: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 5118: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 5141: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DELGADO, and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 5170: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 5175: Mr. HAGEDORN.
H.R. 5191: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 5248: Mr. HECK.
H.R. 5297: Ms. HAALAND and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 5299: Ms. WEXTON and Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 5434: Mr. COOPER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. HUIZENGA.
H.R. 5517: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KILMER, Mr. COX of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 5541: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 5545: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 5546: Mr. NEGUSE and Mr. ARMSTRONG.
H.R. 5572: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 5580: Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 5581: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 5589: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 5598: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. PIN-GREE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5601: Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 5610: Mr. HECK.
H.R. 5630: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 5690: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. HAALAND.
H.R. 5697: Mr. KILMER and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.J. Res. 48: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H. Res. 50: Mr. WATKINS, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. MAST.
H. Res. 395: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. SIRES.
H. Res. 579: Mrs. AXNE.
H. Res. 672: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H. Res. 720: Mrs. AXNE.
H. Res. 775: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CORREA, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SIRES, Mr. HORSFORD, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H. Res. 783: Ms. STEFANIK.
H. Res. 803: Mr. STEUBE and Mr. GAETZ.
H. Res. 813: Mr. HECK.
H. Res. 815: Mr. YARMUTH.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 2382: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

83. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mr. Gregory Watson, a citizen of Austin, TX, relative to respectfully requesting that Congress offer for ratification by special convention conducted within the individual states, pursuant to Article V, an amendment to the United States Constitution which would dis-

qualify any member of the US House of Representatives, who is, at the time a declared candidate for the office of President of the US, from casting a vote upon the impeachment of an incumbent President and which would likewise disqualify any member of the US Senate, who is, at the time, a declared

candidate for the office of President, from casting a vote in a trial taking place in the US Senate relative to the removal from office of an incumbent President; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.